UC-NRLF
$B 59 322
E
98
F6W3
WATERMAN
E 98 F6 W3
LC 49288

JUN 24 1915

THE EXPLANATORY ELEMENT IN THE FOLK-TALES OF THE NORTH-AMERICAN INDIANS.

BY T. T. WATERMAN.

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia University.

Reprinted from The Journal of American Folk-Lore, Vol. XXVII, No. CIII, January-March, 1914

E98
.F6W3

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

[Reprinted from THE JOURNAL OF AMERICAN FOLK-LORE, Vol. XXVII., No. CIII., January–March, 1914.]

THE EXPLANATORY ELEMENT IN THE FOLK-TALES OF THE NORTH-AMERICAN INDIANS.

BY T. T. WATERMAN.

CONSPICUOUS among the very striking features of primitive mythologies is the ingenious way in which tales are employed to explain the various facts and fancies familiar to primitive folk. In our own European folk-tales this function has been to some degree lost; and in the cases where "explanations of phenomena" are a part of our folk-tales, the explanations themselves sometimes concern rather trifling things. For an example I might mention "The Story of the Straw, the Coal, and the Bean," — a favorite in Grimm's familiar "Household Tales," — which tells why the bean to-day has a curious seam around it.[1] With primitive folk the case is otherwise. In connection, perhaps, with a more solemn attitude toward folk-lore of all sorts, we find a large number of stories devoted to the explanation of serious matters, and we find such explanations treated with respect. I should like to give as an example one that is often quoted, from the folk-lore of British Columbia.

The Black Bear and the Chipmunk once contended against each other, the former for darkness, the latter for light. The Bear cried, "Lipa, Lipa, Lipa!" and the Chipmunk, "Ma'a, ma'a, ma'a!" The Bear, finding that the Chipmunk was his equal in the possession of magic powers, finally became enraged, and would have killed his adversary; but the Chipmunk was too quick for him, and ran into his hole just as the Bear made a dash for him. The Bear scratched the Chipmunk when going into his hole. This is the origin of the present stripes on the chipmunk's back. If the Bear had managed to kill the Chipmunk, we should have had eternal darkness instead of day and night, as we have at present.[2]

This myth has the outward appearance of having been devised to account for certain definite facts. I do not think, however, that we

[1] See the numerous explanatory tales in Oskar Dähnhardt's Natursagen.

[2] Thompson, 1, p. 61 (for full titles, see bibliography, pp. 50–54).

305653

need to assume that this tale, merely because it explains something very neatly, was *consciously* invented. Its undoubted literary merit as a tale, for instance, does not compel us to believe that its plot was consciously elaborated. In any case, however, the explanation certainly fits into the plot of the story as though it belonged there. We might very readily suppose that in this and similar cases the tendency to explain a certain thing has had something to do with the origin and the shaping of the tale. In most mythologies the number of tales in which, as in this one, the explanation is explicit and ingenious, is very large. Such tales form a very striking feature in the folk-lore of North America, and they are by no means unheard of elsewhere. It might readily be assumed, therefore, that the desire for explaining one thing or another may have played in general a considerable part in the formation of folk-tales. This is in fact the most popular method of explaining the "origin" of myths. The purpose of the present paper is to find out whether or not the "explanatory tendency" will account for the origin of the native folk-tales of North America.

THE METHOD.

It is rather evident that any discussion concerning the actual development of folk-tales must be based on something other than ascertainable historical data. A documentary history, even for the development of our own folk-lore during its literary period, is in all likelihood out of the question. This fact has been widely recognized; and the writers who deal at all with the history of folk-lore attempt to reconstruct that history either on the basis of psychological probabilities, or on the study of folk-lore as it is found to exist among modern peoples. It is not altogether clear how far conclusions drawn from present conditions can be applied to the past stages of history. Until the contrary is proved, I think it is certainly a fair assumption, however, that any forces we may discover at work now have been at work probably also in the past. This idea is applicable, of course, to all branches of human activity. The products and expressions of human thought to-day are in general so obviously similar to the productions of former peoples, even those of long-past ages, that we may assume a fundamental similarity of thought, a fundamental parallelism of mental processes. The method, it seems to me, of learning about the past by studying the present, is especially applicable in the study of folk-lore. This is perhaps a good time to insist on the point that myths and folk-tales are certainly not altogether the product of "a kind of thought now extinct," as Lang puts it. On the contrary, myths are in process of formation to-day.[1] They are developing around

[1] Van Gennep, in his Origines des Legendes (Paris, 1907), p. 261, refers to this point.

such historical figures as Washington and Benedict Arnold. Abraham Lincoln, for that matter, is essentially a mythical character in the popular imagination. The Lincoln who is pictured in story certainly never had any objective existence. It seems rather important, then, in arranging our ideas about the origin of folk-tales, to discover, first of all, what is true of folk-lore to-day. This study is almost certain to supply some material for conclusions concerning the history of folk-lore in the past.

The present paper is an attempt to investigate the condition of folk-lore in one part of the world only, — America north of Mexico. It is conceivable that conditions in other parts of the world are quite different. The North American field is so large, however, and the material so varied, that it seems plausible to suppose that the general tendencies found to operate here will probably be operative to a greater or less degree in the folk-lore of other regions.

Even in dealing with the folk-lore of America north of Mexico, it seems advisable to narrow the discussion down to certain selected groups of people. The material which forms the basis for the study of American folk-lore has been very unevenly recorded. In some regions the native folk-lore has been preserved in fairly complete form. Many individual tribes, even where they are related to each other, are represented by rather full collections of tales. This is particularly true along the Northwest coast and among certain tribes (especially the Caddoan) on the Southern plains. In other cases the folk-lore map is relatively bare for hundreds of miles. Tribe after tribe, some of them very important, has been ignored by the mythologist, and in some cases the folk-lore has largely disintegrated. This is especially true of northeastern and southeastern North America, though perhaps considerable material may yet be obtained. No two tribes have been more important in historical and ante-historical times than the Sioux and the Iroquois, and yet there are no two tribes about whose mythology we have less information of a satisfactory sort. In view of this condition, there is no apparent reason why the present study should attempt to include material from all the tribes. It seems quite feasible, however, in the present state of the literature, and by proper selection, to make a study which will be fairly representative of the continent as a whole. Therefore, the effort in the following paragraphs will be, not primarily to include as much material as possible, but to distribute the investigation among those tribes that may be considered typical. We ought, I think, to consider at least one, if possible more than one, mythology from each of the seven culture-areas into which the continent may be divided. The following list represents the tribes whose mythologies have been analyzed as a basis for the present paper.

1. Arctic.
   Eskimo.
2. Woodland.
   Micmac.
   Abnaki.
   Ojibwa.
   Fox.
3. Plains.
   Assiniboin.
   Blackfoot.
   Dakota.
   Grosventre.
   Arapaho.
   Omaha-Ponca.
   Pawnee.
4. Southwest.
   Hopi.
   Jicarilla.
5. California.
   Yana.
6. Plateau.
   Shoshoni.
   Thompson.
   Shushwap.
7. North Pacific.
   Chinook.
   Bella Coola.
   Kwakiutl.
   Haida.
   Tlingit.

The writer may appear to have been moved by mere perversity in directing his choice in certain of the above instances. For example, the folk-lore of the Micmac, the second tribe in the list, is in a sad condition, — mixed with European elements, and apparently in large part recast to accord with a European taste. It would perhaps seem better to take up, in place of the Micmac, one of the numerous mythologies concerning which we have relatively complete data. The fourteen Dakota tales which have been analyzed in the present study represent only a small fraction of the mythology of the Dakota people, most of which could undoubtedly be obtained to-day by an observer in the field. There were reasons, however, why these mythologies should be considered. The Micmac are so important from their geographical position, that their folk-lore, it seems, ought to be considered, even though it exists in incomplete or in garbled form. The Dakota are so important as a tribe, that it seems well to include their mythology in the present study, even though we must base our conclusions on only fourteen tales. A good many mythologies, on the other hand, have been omitted purposely. When we have analyzed a hundred and thirteen Pawnee (Skidi) myths and tales, it seems unnecessary to consider the myths of closely allied groups, such as the Chaui or Kitkehahki, or even more remote groups, such as the Wichita and Caddo.

The present paper does not pretend to include all the available material, even in regard to the tribes considered. The literature worked over for each tribe may be regarded, however, as fairly representative, — a point which is perhaps, in this connection, more important than absolute completeness. Wherever possible, collections of tales recorded in some one definite locality were considered, leaving aside such tales as were recorded elsewhere. By this method, even though the total number of tales on which the conclusions are based is reduced, we have the advantage of a complete cross-section through the mythologies of a number of localities. It ought to be clearly borne in mind that the whole body of myth material on which the following study is based has been sifted, and only those sources for any region brought into comparison, which, on account of their com-

pleteness, offer this cross-sectional view. Thus, out of a number of important sources for the folk-lore of the Eskimo, only the tales of the Cumberland Sound tribes have been considered, and selected for comparison with those of other peoples. The reason for this is, that the series of tales from Cumberland Sound [1] is so long that we can be fairly certain that every important tale known to the group is represented in it. In similar fashion the mythology of the Haida Indians of the Queen Charlotte Islands is represented by a single series of tales recorded in the Skidegate dialect. The reason here is, that the tales there recorded represent the most complete, if not the largest, single series of Haida myths so far extant. In cases where we have no long series of tales recorded in one village or among one definite local group, it is necessary to fall back on the less satisfactory collections the provenience of which is not specifically recorded. It might be remarked finally, before passing on to other matters, that by choosing certain complete and representative sources for this study, in place of including all the possible material, the tabulations in the following pages were reduced to a reasonable compass.

It also seems necessary to say a word about certain terms commonly employed in mythological discussions. I believe that in the study of folk-lore, more perhaps than in many other subjects, it is well to reach an understanding concerning the terms employed, before a discussion rather than after it. It is obvious, of course, that folk-tales, to take up merely one branch of folk-lore, may be analyzed and classified under several different headings. A number of terms have come into use in connection with the different varieties of narrative which result from such a classification, — terms such as "myth," "folk-tale," "legend," "tradition," and a number of other less commonplace ones, such as "saga," "Märchen," "conte," and others. Within recent years especially, some effort has been made to restrict the application of certain of these words to some one subdivision of the general subject. Thus the suggestion has been put forward that all stories with a definite hero should be described as "sagas," while those in which the hero is anonymous should be classified as "Märchen" or "contes." [2] This suggestion has been matched with another one, that "saga" should imply a story which is held to be true, stories which are told merely for amusement being referred to as "Märchen." [3] In regard to the most important and most widely used term of all, "myth," there has been, unfortunately, no uniformity of usage. To illustrate this point, a few of the current definitions of "myth" might be cited.

[1] Eskimo, 2, pp. 163–305, 518–535.

[2] Van Gennep, Les Origines des Legendes, pp. 21 et seq. Compare Macculloch's Childhood of Fiction, p. 450.

[3] Gomme, Handbook of Folk-Lore, London, 1890 (Publications of the Folk-Lore Society, vol. xx), p. 111.

Thus Jevons says[1] that "myths are narratives in which the doings of some god are related." Van Gennep understands the word "myth" to imply "stories which are objects of belief, and which are handed down through the medium of magic and religious ceremonies,"[2] whether or not they have to do with gods. The term "myth" is often applied loosely to any tale of the marvellous. When, for example, Dixon calls his well-known volume "Maidu Myths," he does not mean to include any one type of tale to the exclusion of the others. In the opinion of Rivers, the term "myth" should be restricted to those tales which are the subject of the present paper, — tales with an *explanatory* function.[3] Perhaps the best usage is this, that literature becomes mythical when it reflects or refers to the operations of nature. In this sense the word is used, among other writers, by Boas.[4] Admitting that usage in the matter of these terms has not become settled, it seems necessary for the student, first of all, to avoid using them arbitrarily in more than one sense.

One distinction that must, however, be observed, has a quite different basis from those mentioned, and is rendered necessary by the present state of the literature. It must be remarked that a difference exists between what we might call mythical tales on the one hand, and mythical ideas or concepts on the other.

This distinction is useful, because we have a great deal of information about the mythical tales of various peoples, but very little about their mythical notions. There exists a large and rapidly multiplying body of material concerning mythical tales, not only from North America, but from all over the world, and running back in some instances to a considerable antiquity. On the other hand, our information about the mythical notions, particularly of modern uncivilized peoples, is very incomplete, and often lacking altogether. In the North American field especially, the works which preserve the mythical tales of the native peoples, taking into account only published books and monographs, number well up toward a hundred. The papers, on the other hand, which systematically discuss the mythical notions of the Indian tribes, might almost be counted on one hand. As examples merely of what is meant by a "discussion of mythical ideas," reference might be made to the discussion of Bella Coola religion by Boas and of Haida religion by Swanton.[5]

To make the distinction between mythical notions and mythical tales perfectly clear, it might be well to consider a few definite cases.

[1] Idea of God in Early Religions (Cambridge, 1910), p. 33.

[2] Les Origines des Legendes, p. 28.

[3] W. H. R. Rivers, "The Sociological Significance of Myth" (Folk-Lore, vol. xxiii [1912], p. 310).

[4] The Mind of Primitive Man (New York, 1910), p. 230.

[5] Bella Coola, I, pp. 28–48; Haida, I, pp. 11–37.

Among the Indians of North America there is a widespread belief in a bird which produces thunder by clapping its wings, and lightning by winking its eyes. I do not mean to say that this is exclusively an American belief. It is of course found elsewhere; for example, among the Zulu. In America, particularly in northern and western America, this belief plays a very important part in the life of many different tribes, and is a favorite subject for representation in art. This is true, for example, on the Plains and on the North Pacific coast. At the same time, this thunder-bird does not appear very generally as an actor in the mythical tales.[1] It therefore supplies an example of what is meant by a mythical belief or notion. The wide currency of this concept, moreover, makes clear the point that a mythical belief can develop and become important independently of any connection with any particular story. A further example of the distinction between tales and concepts is found in the belief, apparently of universal acceptance, that the sky is a solid vault, and that beyond or upon the sky is a flat country very much like this one, with vegetation and inhabitants. This conception, while not itself a tale, affords a background for many tales. While this concept may serve indirectly to explain many things to the Indian, such as rain, the movement of the sun, and the like, it has of course no basis in fact, and is another example of a mythical belief. A folk may be provided with quite a series of such ideas, embodying notions not only of a sky country, but of worlds underneath this one, or of a world of the dead, to which spirits go at death. They may also have quite definite even though absolutely mistaken notions of the forces which produce such events as eclipses or earthquakes. The point I wish to emphasize is, that at the present time there are hardly enough complete accounts of these mythical notions accessible to render possible a discussion of them, or to afford a basis of study. The present investigation at least has to do only with the question of the part played by explanations in the formation of tales or stories. Only that part of folk-lore has been considered which consists of tales having definite plots.

WHAT IS EXPLAINED BY FOLK-TALES.

Returning now to the subject of inquiry, namely, the part played by the explanatory tendency in the growth of folk-tales, several points seem to stand out especially as subjects for investigation. I think the first question to suggest itself might be worded somewhat as follows: "If there are a large number of explanatory tales in various mythologies,

[1] It is found in the stories of the Ojibwa, Bella Coola, Kwakiutl, Tillamook, Thompson, Shuswap, and Assiniboin, and perhaps elsewhere. As a mythical idea and in artistic representations, however, it is found among practically all the tribes of northern and central North America.

what do they explain?" The mere variety of objects accounted for through the medium of folk-tales is a study which must throw light of a more or less direct sort on the psychology of the myth-makers.[1] I suggest this, therefore, as the first appropriate topic for investigation. Unfortunately, as soon as we begin to study primitive folk-tales with a view to seeing in this way what is explained, we are confronted with the absolute necessity of deciding what is to be considered as an explanation. It is often hard to tell whether a given passage constitutes an explanation of a given subject, or is merely a passing reference to it. It is, to be sure, easy enough to find a great number of tales which in their present form are unmistakably explanatory. In trying to find out the total range of explanation, — that is, in trying to bring together *all* the cases of explanation for study and comparison, — the occurrence of these doubtful cases offers a genuine obstacle. It is actually impossible to decide in some cases whether a given tale explains anything or not. The form of the "explanatory" passage may, in the first place, be equivocal. In some cases the native informant may feel very clearly that a given tale is explanatory, without saying so in so many words. It is obvious at once that an informant might have felt, possibly, that the explanatory sense of a tale was so evident that comment on it would be unnecessary. In such cases, where an explanation seems to be clearly implied, are we justified in assuming that an explanation is present? This element of doubt enters into our considerations quite frequently. On the other hand, an informant might conceivably cast a tale into the form of an explanation without deliberately intending anything of the sort. An actual example may make clear the nature of this latter difficulty.

We have three passages in North Pacific coast folk-lore which deal, in almost the same words, with the origin of fire. The first of the passages runs as follows:—

> Raven came to a place where he saw something floating not far from shore. . . . Toward evening he looked at the object, and saw that it resembled fire. So he told a Chicken-hawk, which had a very long bill, to fly out to it, saying, "Be very brave! If you get some of that fire, do not let go of it." The Chicken-hawk reached the place, seized some of the fire, and started back as fast as it could fly; but by the time it got the fire to Raven, its bill was burned off. That is why its bill is short.[2]

This passage, beyond all question, is explanatory. It gives a very definite reason why the chicken-hawk has a short beak. Compare with it another version of the tale from a different locality.[3]

[1] Use has been made of this method by Rivers in the article referred to above (Folk-Lore, vol. xxiii [1912]).

[2] Tlingit, 1, p. 11.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 83.

After this the Raven saw a fire way out at sea. Tying a piece of pitch-wood to a chicken-hawk's bill, he told it to go out to this fire, touch it with the pitch-wood, and bring it back. When he had brought it to him, Raven put it into the rock and the red cedar, etc.

We know from the former tale that this Tlingit tribe sometimes tell this story to explain chicken-hawk's beak. I should say that the chances are great that some such idea was present also in the story-teller's consciousness when the version just above was related. He merely took it for granted that its explanatory force would be felt, and did not feel obliged to point it out. Nevertheless, as the passage stands, it is not an explanation of chicken-hawk's beak; and a person reading this passage without an acquaintance with Northwest coast mythology would hardly suspect that the story would so much as lend itself to the explanation of this particular point.

Consider, finally, the following from Haida mythology.[1]

After a while, Raven came to one who had a fire in his house. And he did not know how to get his live-coals. And somebody had bought a deer-skin. "Say, cousin, I want to borrow your deer-skin for a while." And he lent it to him. It had a long tail, they say, and he tied a bundle of pitch-wood to the end of the tail. Then he came in and danced before him. As he danced, his face was turned toward the fire only. After he had danced for a while, he struck his tail into the fire, and the pitch-wood burned. Then his tail was burned off, they say. That is why the deer's tail is short. Then he went into his own skin and flew away with the live-coals. His beak, too, was burned off. And they pursued him. They could not catch him, and turned back. He got the coals neatly.

I should like to point out that even this passage, though it actually goes so far as to point out that Raven's beak was burned off, is not in such form that we can be sure that the native story-teller felt it to be an explanation of the shortness of the raven's beak at the present time. The setting for an explanation is all there, but is the explanation actually present or not? The question is, of course, whether the native informant feels it as an explanation. So much, then, for the difficulty of recognizing the explanations which appear in the text. The obstacles which arise in dealing statistically with such material are obvious. Owing to the endless uncertainty which would result from any other method, only those tales have been reckoned as explanatory in which, on somebody's authority, the statement is made that something is explained. It is quite possible that many explanations have been ignored. The present paper, however, must be recognized as a study of what is explained by those passages which are definitely labelled as explanatory by the native informant. All other passages and all other explanations have been ruled out.

[1] Haida, I, p. 135.

We have not only the difficulty of recognizing explanations when we see them; but the explanations show amazing variability as regards their connection with the story-plot. In some cases the two seem to be indissolubly connected. For example, it is almost impossible to conceive of the Tlingit myth of the theft of daylight by Raven[1] as anything else than at bottom an explanation of daylight on earth. We do, however, find explanatory tales where the explanation is very loosely attached to the subject-matter. I think a good example of this would be the tales with a ceremonial ending, of the type which is very common on the Northwest coast of America. There is, for example, the much-loved tale of the person who meets a cannibal spirit, and escapes after a remarkable and perfectly definite series of adventures, which are repeated in various forms by a great many tribes. On the Northwest coast such a tale ends very often by referring the use of some ceremonial object to this adventure.[2] Here the "conclusion" or "explanation" has little real connection with the story-plot. In the case of some tales the explanation is so inappropriate, that the casual reader could almost suggest a better one, — one more in keeping with the incidents in the plot. In the matter of unity between the plot and the explanation, the variation is simply enormous.

The explanations occurring in folk-tales differ endlessly in regard to style. A favorite type of myth in America is one in which the culture-hero comes along and teaches the people, for example, to make baskets, — an art unknown till that time. Or, for that matter, he teaches them to hold sexual intercourse, or how to plant crops. This might be called the "pedagogical" type of explanation. Another very important type of tale in America is one in which the culture-hero transforms somebody or something into some permanent feature of the landscape or into some well-known animal. Every such story is in a sense explanatory. A few examples may be given to illustrate this. Raven, for instance, among the Tlingit, is pictured coming down-river with the daylight, which he had succeeded in stealing from Raven-at-head-of-Nass. Angered at certain beings who were fishing at the mouth of the river, he releases the daylight, transforming them into animals, each according to the type of the blanket he was wearing at the time. This tale is in a sense an "explanation" of the animals on earth and their appearance. Tales of this type are too numerous to mention, and make up a very considerable bulk of American mythology. As far as they explain anything at all, they involve what might be called an explanation by "transformation." In the following an attempt has been made to assemble all the explanatory passages, no matter what the type of explanation.

[1] See B, p. 311; Tlingit, I, p. 3.

[2] Kwakiutl, I, pp. 87, 513.

Without attempting to assume that all should be given equal weight in forming our conclusions, it may nevertheless be said that such an accumulation of explanatory passages of all kinds will at least illustrate the range of primitive speculation.

An attempt has been made, however, to distinguish between inclusive and particularistic explanations. For example, the myth recounting the adventures and career of some culture-hero may include the statement that "he taught the people all the arts." Or a creation myth may involve the mere statement that the creator "made all the animals." Some other incident, like that of the burning of the world, may account for the fact that "there are stars" in the heavens. Such explanations are certainly to be distinguished psychologically from the minute and carefully localized tales which account for some one definite fact, like the topography of a certain familiar cliff, or the peculiar markings on some definite animal, or the movement and appearance of some definite constellation. It would seem that the distinction in such cases must have been present also in the native mind, whatever may be said of the other instances previously referred to. It seems well to pass over for the present any distinctions which might be drawn between the explanations which are casual and those which are really the motive of the stories in which they occur, and also to ignore for our present purpose the type of the explanation; that is, whether it is pedagogical, or based on the idea of transformation. The study merely of the popularity of one or the other type of explanation would itself be an interesting undertaking, and would shed some light on primitive psychology. It cannot, however, be undertaken here. The difference just mentioned between the broad and the particularistic explanations, is, however, so fundamental, that the two types of explanation have been indicated in the following study by different symbols.

The total range of things explained, and the curious way in which these explanations are distributed over the face of nature, are shown briefly in the following tabulation. In this table an asterisk indicates a generalized explanation. Numerals show the number of explanations of individual or particular phenomena under each general head. For example, opposite the heading "Culture," in the Abnaki column, the asterisk stands for the statement, "The hero taught the people all the arts;" in the Ojibwa column, the numeral 1 means that a hero established one element of culture (in this case, wampum); in the Blackfoot column, the asterisk followed by the numeral 3 indicates that a being arranged for "everything in the life of the people," and, further, that three additional explanations account for the origin of three individual cultural phenomena (in this case, quill-work, etc.).

TABLE SHOWING WHAT PHENOMENA ARE THE SUBJECT OF EXPLANATION IN THE VARIOUS MYTHOLOGIES.

	Cumberland Sound Eskimo, Source 3.	Micmac.	Abnaki.	Ojibwa.	Fox.	Assiniboin.	Blackfoot.	Dakota, Sources 1, 2.	Grosventre.	Arapaho.	Omaha-Ponca.	Pawnee (Skidi) Sources 1, 2.	Hopi.	Jicarilla.	Yana, Sources 1, 2.	Shoshoni.	Thompson, Sources 1, 2.	Shushwap.	Chinook.	Bella Coola, Sources 1, 2.	Kwakiutl.	Haida, Source 1.	Tlingit.	Chukchee.	Koryak.
Sun	1	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	2	...	2	1	2	...	...	2	1	1	1	1	...
Moon	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	3	1	3	1	...	...	...	1	1	...	...
Stars	...	...	...	1	...	1	3	...	...	1	...	*2	*	...	*	...	1	...	...	*	...	*	...	...	...
Milky Way	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...
Constellations	2	...	...	1	2	1	1	...	...	3	...	...	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...
Day and night	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Seasons	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...
Clouds	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Thunder	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	1	...	...	1	...	2	1	...	...	1	...	1	...	...
Weather	...	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	1	2	...	...	1	...	...	...	1
Snow	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...
Tides	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	...	1	...	...
Earthquakes	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...
Sky	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	1	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...
Land	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	...	1	3	...	1	1	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	1	1	...	1	...
Water	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	1	1	1	1	...
Mankind	1	...	1	...	...	1	1	...	1	1	...	1	2	1	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	1	1	...
Plants	...	1	...	2	...	...	*	...	...	*	1	*	...	*4	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	*1	1	...	1
Animals	5	1	*	...	...	1	*	...	1	1	...	*2	*2	3	1	*1	*1	...	...	6	3	2	*4	*	1
Death	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	3	1	2	...	...	1	1	1	...	...	...	1	...	1	1	...
Fire	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	1	1	...	1	...	...	1	...	...
Topography	5	8	3	3	...	1	8	...	...	4	2	5	3	5	7	5	24	10	3	3	26	35	11	1	...
Echo	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Human traits	...	...	1	...	...	1	5	2	2	...	...	4	4	...	3	5	6	2	2	2	3	7	3	3	...
Animal traits	9	10	19	13	6	16	11	7	2	13	11	24	16	17	6	9	44	32	10	8	25	16	*9	...	1
Plant traits	...	1	...	...	1	1	4	1	...	2	1	5	...	1	...	...	6	1	...	...	2	3	2	...	...
Tribal groups	2	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	*1	...	...	*	...	...	...	**	*	5	...	...	...
Tribal traits	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	6	1	1	...	...	5	3	...	5	3	1	...	...
Languages	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	*	...	...	*	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	*	2	...	...	...
Culture	...	*	*	2	...	4	*7	1	1	7	...	*10	1	2	4	...	5	...	2	**1	7	14	*6	...	...
Customs	...	...	...	...	...	1	2	...	...	2	...	...	1	1	1	1	1	...	...	1	...	1	2	...	1
Ceremonies	1	...	...	3	4	*1	35	2	2	32	1	24	*3	...	1	...	1	1	2	3	51	4	*13	1	...
Unclassified	2	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	1	...	5	...	2	...	...	1	2	1	2	2	4	1	...	...

This tabulation involves a number of interesting points. Perhaps these points will come out most clearly if we consider the mythologies one by one. Taking up first the folk-lore of the Eskimo, we find that the group which we have chosen for study possesses only one tale which explains the first phenomenon on the list, the *sun*. This seems at once rather extraordinary, in view of the fact that there are nine tales which explain the traits of animals. There are, however, many animals, and only one sun. The traits of all the different animals, that differ from each other in appearance and in habits, offer a better field for explanation than does the sun, which is simple in outward appearance, and regular in its movements. One explanatory tale might, after all, in the case of the sun, be considered to meet the situation fully; while, in the case of animals, each species demands an explanation to itself. Nevertheless, I am convinced that certain conclusions concerning the interest of the Eskimo are deducible from a consideration of what their tales explain. It is at once obvious, for example, that they find animal traits more interesting than they do the topography of their country, and are in turn more interested in topography than they are in ceremonies or in the peculiarities of the state of culture in which they live. I am inclined, moreover, in a general way, to extend this conclusion to their interest in earthly as opposed to heavenly or celestial matters. The topics in the first column of the tabulation are so arranged that the first sixteen terms refer to things in the heavens, or, more generally speaking, to cosmic forces. The last seventeen, on the other hand, appearing toward the bottom of the column, constitute a list of the things on earth which appear in the tales as the object of explanation. If we now consider the total number of heavenly phenomena which are explained in tales, we find that they amount, in the case of Eskimo mythology, to only six in all; while in the same mythology the tales which explain earthly matters reach a total of twenty-six. I see no reason why, if a people were interested in the heavens, they should not find as many things transpiring there which demand explanation as they would find on the earth. This is especially true of the heavens in the arctic regions. The absence of the sun from the sky during long periods, the amazing display of the Northern Lights, seem calculated in themselves to attract comment and speculation. If a student approached the subject without a previous acquaintance with Eskimo mythology, arguing from purely psychological probabilities, he would certainly expect to find in Eskimo tales, if tales are ever used for explanation, some reference to the sudden and furious arctic storms, which are a matter of extreme personal interest to every Eskimo, from their effect on the food-supply.[1] I am therefore disposed to think that the dis-

[1] See Eskimo, 2, pp. 460, 603.

tribution of explanations in the case of the Eskimo reflects some very real psychological bias. I think it is important to see whether this tendency to limit speculation largely to earthly matters finds wide expression in primitive folk-lore. Eskimo folk-tales as recorded in Cumberland Sound would certainly indicate that the heavenly bodies and cosmic forces are not matters of most immediate interest to primitive folk.

It is not proper, of course, to base any far-reaching conclusions on the study of one mythology, or on the occurrence of one phenomenon in various mythologies. I think, however, that if a consideration of all twenty-six of the mythologies which are here the object of analysis, bears out the conclusions we made concerning Eskimo mythology, we shall have established a fact which, however it may be explained, must at all events be recognized. The total number of tales which explain the various phenomena in the twenty-six mythologies here discussod, is shown in the following table. In order to bring out the contrast referred to above between the comparative number of celestial and earthly "explanations," the material has been arranged in parallel columns.

SUMMARY SHOWING THE TOTAL NUMBER OF TALES WHICH EXPLAIN THE VARIOUS PHENOMENA LISTED ABOVE.

CELESTIAL OR COSMIC.		EARTHLY OR LOCAL.	
Phenomena.	*Number of Tales.*	*Phenomena.*	*Number of Tales.*
Sun	18	Mankind	15
Moon	20	Plants	17
Stars	19	Animals	45
Milky Way	3	Death	14
Constellations	14	Fire	6
Day and night	5	Topography	174
Seasons	5	Echo	1
Clouds	2	Human traits	58
Thunder	11	Animal traits	356
Weather	10	Plant traits	32
Snow	1	Tribal groups	14
Tides	3	Tribal traits	28
Earthquakes	1	Languages	6
Sky	6	Culture	81
Land	13	Customs	15
Water	7	Ceremonies	191
Total	138	Total	1053

From this table it is clear, that, in twenty-six mythologies, the total number of tales explaining the heavenly bodies and meteorological and hydrographic phenomena is 138, while the total number referring to earthly or local matters is 1053. In other words, conclusions based on twenty-six separate mythologies quite bear out those based on Eskimo alone. The total number of "celestial" explanations is only one-eighth of the total number of "terrestrial" explanations.

I should like now to look at our material from the point of view of the number of individual mythologies, among the total of twenty-six, as contrasted with the number of tales, which contain explanatory tales relating to the various heavenly bodies and cosmic forces.

Let us consider, for example, the importance in folk-tales of one celestial body, the sun, this time from the point of view of the number of mythologies in a given area in which he occurs as the object of explanation. Arranged across the top of our tabulation, in a horizontal line, will be found a list of mythologies so far analyzed. If we look along the line following "sun," and read the figures which appear in connection with the names of the various tribes, we see that only certain tribes explain the sun at all in their folk-tales. The Micmac tribe, for example, or the Blackfoot, have no story at all explaining the origin or appearance of the sun, as far as can be ascertained from their folk-lore in its present form. Out of twenty-six representative American mythologies, about which we have fairly complete information, the sun is explained in only thirteen. I am inclined to think that this fact, if it can be substantiated by the study of mythologies in other parts of the world, renders necessary a reconsideration of those mythical theories which would make the heavenly bodies the fountain and source of primitive myth and folk-tale.

Sun	in	13	mythologies.		
Moon	"	15	"		
Stars	"	11	"		
Milky Way	"	3	"		
Constellations	"	9	"		
Day and Night	"	4	"		
Seasons	"	5	"		
Clouds	"	2	"		
Thunder	"	10	"		
Weather	"	9	"		
Snow	"	1	"		
Tides	"	3	"		
Earthquakes	"	1	"		
Sky	"	6	"		
Land	"	10	"		
Water	"	7	"		
Mankind	in	14	mythologies.		
Plants	"	11	"		
Animals	"	20	"		
Death	"	11	"		
Fire	"	6	"		
Topography	"	22	"		
Echo	"	1	"		
Human traits	"	18	"		
Animal traits	"	25	"		
Plant traits	"	15	"		
Tribal groups	"	7	"		
Tribal traits	"	11	"		
Languages	"	5	"		
Culture	"	18	"		
Customs	"	12	"		
Ceremonies	"	21	"		

It is a fact of some significance that such important and conspicuous phenomena as the sun, the Milky Way, the seasons, the clouds, the over-arching sky, are explained in the folk-tales of a few tribes only here and there. The tales of many tribes ignore them completely, as far as making any attempt to explain them through the medium of tales is concerned. Even such all-important objects as the sun and the moon, about whose place in mythology volumes have been written, are explained in only half the mythologies we are considering. The table, therefore, quite bears out the preceding one in two important points. In the first place, it gives us a right to

suspect that something is wrong with those mythical hypotheses which lay all the emphasis on the heavenly bodies as the basis of folk-tales. It seems quite plausible that, if the mythology of primitive people were in any sense based on the heavenly bodies and cosmic forces, these bodies and forces ought to appear constantly as the objects of the speculative tendency. We have every reason, on the basis of our present material, to withhold concurrence on this point and to investigate it more fully. The second point, which comes out in even clearer light, is the interest shown by primitive people in the traits of animals and in topography. We saw from the former tabulation that animal traits are a very popular subject of explanation in mythical tales, from the point of view of the number of tales devoted to them. We see now that they occur with great *regularity* as the object of explanation, appearing in almost every mythology of the whole twenty-six here investigated. I should like to refer also to the extreme interest in ceremonial matters indicated by the tabulation. Ceremonial explanations in certain cases exceed in number even the explanations of animal traits (see p. 12). This is true of no other element. Reference might be made particularly to the case of the Kwakiutl and the Blackfoot. Ceremonial explanations also are a very considerable element in explanatory tales, taking all the mythologies together (see p. 14). They also come prominently to the front in the case of almost every mythology. Adding together the explanations which concern ceremonies, animal traits, and topography, — all of them "earthly" phenomena, — we reach a total which makes the number of "celestial" explanations seem inconsiderable. The evidence so far considered would, in brief, seem to indicate that primitive folk, at least in North America, are certainly not interested in celestial phenomena to the exclusion of everything else. Their interest in the heavens seems to be of a very casual sort.

It seems rather important to check up these results, however, by some further considerations, before placing implicit reliance on them. I should like now to bring out the contrast between the celestial and the terrestrial elements in folk-tales from another point of view; namely, from the point of view of the *actors* who appear in tales.

The tabulation opposite indicates this briefly. In working out this tabulation, also a certain amount of difficulty was encountered. Various categories had to be devised to include the large number of characters which appear, and these categories overlap to a certain degree. This fact implies, that, in placing an actor in one or the other of these categories, we must, in certain cases at least, be somewhat arbitrary. To give an example, animals are almost everywhere thought to have supernatural power. In those tales in which they appear as benefactors or supernatural helpers of human

TABLE SHOWING THE NUMBER OF TALES IN WHICH EACH OF A NUMBER OF ACTORS APPEARS.

	Cumberland Sound Eskimo.	Micmac.	Abnaki.	Ojibwa.	Fox.	Assiniboin.	Blackfoot.	Dakota.	Grosventre.	Arapaho.	Omaha-Ponca.	Pawnee (Skidi).	Hopi.	Jicarilla.	Yana.	Shoshoni.	Thompson.	Shushwap.	Chinook.	Bella Coola.	Kwakiutl.	Haida.	Tlingit.	Chukchee.	Koryak.
Sun	1	...	...	2	1	3	6	...	...	3	3	6	3	1	3	2	3	...	...	9	5	...	1	1	4
Moon	3	...	...	1	...	...	5	...	1	1	1	3	...	...	4	1	3	1	...	1	3	3	1	1	1
Stars	2	...	...	...	...	4	6	1	1	4	...	11	1	...	1	...	2	2	...	...	3	...	2	...	...
Sky	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...
Warmth	...	1	...	1	...	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Cold	...	1	...	1	...	3	1	1	...	1	1	...	...	...	2	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	4
Thunder	1	...	2	1	2	5	2	3	4	2	3	3	...	2	3	1	2	2	1	3	11	1	1	1	...
Wind	...	1	1	3	...	1	1	1	...	1	...	6	1	1	1	...	1	1	...	1	1	4	2	1	1
Water (and water monsters)	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	1	...	3	...	...	...	...	5	...	...	1	...	1	2	...
Echo	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	...
Topography	...	...	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	17	...	...	3
Animals	19	20	16	10	18	66	54	10	22	55	34	70	57	29	27	40	54	62	18	27	78	82	66	14	35
Plants	...	...	1	2	1	...	...	...	1	...	1	3	...	...	4	...	5	3	...	2	3	5	2	...	10
Objects	4	...	...	...	...	4	2	1	2	3	...	2	...	4	6	3	3	3	2	1	5	2	4	3	11
Culture Hero	...	6	9	13	13	54	26	...	16	...	...	...	...	8	...	...	25	30	...	...	46	51	28	4	42
Ghosts	1	...	...	1	4	...	6	...	1	2	1	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	7	3	7	2	1
Divinities (not animals or ghosts)	12	...	...	1	3	1	5	1	...	4	1	5	35	3	...	...	8	1	3	10	19	22	7	15	9
Unclassified	1	...	...	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	3	1	1	6	...	3	2	1	...	2	4	5	3	6

beings, are they to be reckoned as animals, or as divinities? Moreover, there is a certain difficulty in deciding who the actors in a given story really are. The hero of a tale does not always appear in his true guise. For example, is it always possible to recognize, in a hasty examination, all the tales in which the Sun appears as an actor? He may appear in the form of a mortal hero, whose celestial qualities are brought out, let us say, only at the very end of the story, or only implied by his adventures or attributes. The issue has been met in the present instance by ignoring the difficulty. The tabulation on p. 17 is based on the actual condition of the folk-lore at the present time. Unless a character is specifically stated to be the Sun, he is not reckoned as the Sun. I am aware that a great deal has been done in the way of identifying the actors in myths as celestial bodies or cosmic forces by their attributes. Without wishing to enter into a discussion of this point,[1] and without attempting here to formulate any general principles, I wish to say merely, in regard to the American field, that, after all, the folk-lore we are considering has been recorded in very large part by responsible observers, endowed with acumen and curiosity. If any of the present folk really regard a hero as the sun, for example, these investigators can be relied upon to ascertain that fact and to call it to our attention. The present study concerns itself with the present form of the material and with the present attitude of the people. In the following paragraphs, then, the effort is made merely to look at the material as it comes from their hands. We deal only with the actors in myths, therefore, whom the native informants are conscious of as actors.

In view of the fact, however, that the heavenly bodies are sometimes supposed to be the fountain and source of all folk-lore, and that a certain interest attaches to them on account of that point of view, all the characters which exercise control in any way over the heavenly bodies or the cosmic forces are included in the general results. There has been no attempt to identify a given character as the sun on the basis of his attributes; but every character who is definitely stated to have control over the sun is represented in the tabulation. This method has been followed throughout. If a character, for example, has control, either by magic or otherwise, over "warm weather" or "summer," the fact has been indicated in the tabulation. The tabulation also includes, for the reasons just assigned, all those characters, of which there are a good many in folk-lore of certain tribes, who are transformed into stars or other heavenly bodies at the close of the narrative. It is perhaps necessary to say that the tabulation does not purport to show all the actors in all mythical tales. It shows

[1] For an elaboration of it, see R. H. Lowie, "The Test Theme in North American Mythology" (this Journal, vol. xxi, p. 101).

merely the frequency and regularity with which certain chosen actors appear. The characters which have been chosen, however, are the most important ones, to whom I think the greatest amount of interest attaches.

The results of this table may be summarized as follows:—

SUMMARY SHOWING ACTORS AND CHARACTERS APPEARING IN AMERICAN FOLK-TALES.

Regions.	Tribes.	Number of tales.	Number in which cosmic forces appear as actors.	Number in which animals appear as actors.
Arctic	Cumberland Sound Eskimo	98	8	19
Woodland	Micmac	43	3	20
	Abnaki	29	3	16
	Ojibwa	38	9	10
	Fox	46	4	18
Plains	Assiniboin	98	17	66
	Blackfoot	97	21	54
	Dakota	14	6	10
	Grosventre	42	7	22
	Arapaho	100	13	55
	Omaha-Ponca	50	9	34
	Pawnee (Skidi)	113	29	70
Southwest	Hopi	85	8	57
	Jicarilla	39	4	29
California	Yana	21	17	27
Plateau	Shoshoni	45	4	40
	Thompson	73	11	54
	Shushwap	69	14	62
North Pacific	Chinook	21	1	18
	Bella Coola	53	15	27
	Kwakiutl	177	24	78
	Haida	102	10	82
	Tlingit	107	8	66
	Chukchee	35	6	14
	Koryak	131	10	35

It is obvious at once that a conclusion based on the former tabulation would have to be revised somewhat, in the light of the facts brought out by the present one. The Sun, for example, plays a much more important part as an actor in mythical tales than as an object for explanation. Half of our mythologies ignore the Sun in giving explanations of natural phenomena; but the Sun appears as an *actor* in a great many, — to speak accurately, in sixteen out of twenty-six. It is perhaps worth noting that he appears in the more complete mythologies, not in the fragmentary ones. Thus, he does not appear in the mythology of the Micmac, the Abnaki, the Dakota, or the Chinook. Reference to the tabulation will show that we base our conclusions, in the case of the Abnaki, on only twenty-nine tales; and in the case of the Dakota, on fourteen. Altogether, it seems to be rather obvious that the sun is an object of extreme interest to most primitive peoples in North America, though we must conclude, nevertheless, that

they do not seem to feel such a need for explaining his existence and action as they do in the case of many other things which to our minds would seem less important. A general tendency is brought out, however, which does corroborate more or less our former conclusion. The total number of tales in which celestial actors appear is rather small. Thus, while we have ninety-eight distinct tales from the Cumberland Sound Eskimo, the Sun appears as an actor in only one. In fact, if we add together all the tales in which celestial actors appear, the total number is small compared to the total number in which even one group of terrestrial actors (animals, for instance) appear. The contrast is brought out in the present summary (p. 19). It is quite possible to say that cosmic forces are not the chief subject of folk-lore, by any means, at the present time, either as actors or as subjects for explanation and speculation.

HOW IMPORTANT ARE THE EXPLANATIONS IN FOLK-TALES.

It occurs to me that the rôle played by the "explanatory" tendency can very easily be overestimated. I believe the interest in explanations is not so predominant in the primitive mind as might be supposed. Here I should like to refer to the opinions of Andrew Lang as expressed in his "Myth, Ritual, and Religion,"[1] and elsewhere in his writings. He goes so far as to express the idea that all myths are ætiological, — intended primarily to explain. If he did not originate this idea, he is at least responsible for its popularity among English writers at the present time.[2] I should like, therefore, to direct attention now to the attitude of primitive people themselves toward "explanations," as far as we can define their attitude at all. In line with this, I should like to ascertain precisely to what extent the tendency to explain the world has actually resulted in the formation of explanatory tales. On this latter point also I am inclined to think that popular opinion has overshot the mark. The actual number of explanatory tales is, after all, not so overwhelmingly large. We have, then, two points to consider, — first, how important to the people themselves is the interest in explanations; and, second, what actual proportion of traditional tales is explanatory. In other words, I propose that we consider this tendency, first subjectively as regards the native, and then objectively as it expresses itself in explanatory tales.

In regard to the first point, I might say very briefly that a very wrong idea of the Indian's attitude toward folk-tales would be ob-

[1] A. Lang, Myth, Ritual, and Religion (London, 1887), vol. i, pp. 122, 161.

[2] See Gomme, Handbook of Folk-Lore (London, 1890), p. 1 (Publications of the Folk-Lore Society, vol. xx); Jevons, Idea of God in Early Religions (Cambridge, 1910), pp. 33, 50; Introduction to the History of Religion (London, 1892), pp. 250, 261, 263; Macculloch, Childhood of Fiction (London, 1905), p. 451.

tained if one supposed that his interest was primarily in the explanations. If any one fact becomes clear from an acquaintance with Indian society, it is this, — that the satisfaction which Indian audiences get out of the recital of a tale is not an intellectual, but an emotional one. Even admitting that certain tales explain, the Indian of the present time listens to them, not because of a hunger for intellectual satisfaction, but because he genuinely loves to listen to a good story. In fact, the absorbing interest which primitive people take in stories as stories is one of the picturesque features of primitive life. It seems fairly clear that the explanations in folk-tales, considered from the standpoint of the attitude of primitive people toward them, are of decidedly less importance than the novelistic elements of the plot.

We come now to the question of what proportion of mythology is made up of explanatory tales. It is obvious here that we cannot simply count the number of explanatory tales in one mythology (supposing for a moment that that is easily done), and compare it with the number in another mythology. We have, unfortunately, from certain groups, only a dozen or fourteen tales; while another mythology may consist of a hundred tales, or even more. Obviously we must reduce the whole to some common basis. The simplest way is to find what per cent of each collection of tales is of the "explanatory" type. It will at once be clear, however, from what was said above of the difficulty of recognizing and identifying explanations, that the situation is rather confusing. It will also be remembered that, where many sources of error exist, our results cannot be expected to be of a mathematically exact kind. In the present case we have the added difficulty of ascertaining how many *tales* there are in a given mythology, as a preliminary step in finding out what per cent of them is explanatory. This step itself is not without its difficulty. In some cases the results obtained by two investigators must be utilized in conjunction. This is true, for example, in the case of the Blackfoot, where the collections of Wissler and Duvall contain many tales which also appear in Grinnell.[1] In nearly every collection of mythical tales, whether by one author or two, there are a certain number which appear twice. In the present case, where any investigator in the field has recorded two versions of a tale, they must be combined in some way, and counted but once; otherwise our results would not be at all representative. The difficulty lies in recognizing whether we are dealing in any given case with two similar tales, or with two versions or renditions of one and the same tale. Where the various parts of a mythology have been recorded by different observers, the difficulty becomes

[1] Blackfoot Lodge Tales, New York, 1892.

acute. The natural differences of expression which creep in lead to all sorts of confusion and uncertainty in the mind of the reader.

There are other things, too, which tend to make the subject one of some complexity. There is, for example, no uniformity among authors in the matter of recording the long myth cycles which are sometimes found among primitive people. Sometimes such cycles are made up of a long series of independent or largely independent episodes. One author will print these episodes as so many separate tales, supplying merely one general heading or label for the series. An example of this is offered by Lowie's treatment of the coyote stories, in his paper on the Assiniboin.[1] Another author will include a large number of such episodes as more or less clearly distinguished subdivisions of one tale which he considers an organic whole. This is the way in which Swanton looks at the Raven myth of the Tlingit,[2] which really involves a great many separate tales of wide individual distribution; for example, the tale of the trickster who tries to "imitate his hosts."[3] In some cases, however, the stories are run together in one continuous narrative, as in the story of Mink and the story of Omeatl among the Kwakiutl.[4] How much of this is due to the native attitude, how much to the scientific editor, becomes a serious question. To render one of these collections really comparable with another, the present writer was often induced to break up a long cycle into its constituent elements. For example, Swanton's Haida story of "Raven travelling"[5] was broken up into fifty-one separate tales. For all of the reasons indicated, the present writer's enumeration of the total number of mythical tales known to a tribe, or known in a given locality, often does not coincide with the number which would be indicated by the tables of contents in the printed works from which the information is drawn.

Another disturbing element, which can hardly be ignored, and which may lead to error, lies in the fact that a tale sometimes involves ten or a dozen different explanations. Certain tales, for some reason, seem to lend themselves to the explanatory impulse, and are utilized to explain the most diverse matters. The question arises, Should such a tale in the present connection be counted merely as one explanatory tale? Suppose, for example, a mythology consists of fifty tales. Four of these have only one explanation each, while a fifth has (to take a hypothetical case) thirty explanations in it. It would hardly seem right to reckon, under such circumstances, that forty-five fiftieths of the tales are without explanations. Forty-five out of fifty have none; but, on the other hand, for a total of fifty tales, there are thirty-four

[1] Assiniboin, 1.
[2] Tlingit, 1, p. 80.
[3] See p. 45, below.
[4] Kwakiutl, 3, pp. 123–157, 216–240.
[5] Haida, 1, p. 110.

explanations, which, if averaged up, would give one explanation each to more than half of the tales. Before passing on to another point, it might be well to say that in the tabulation on p. 25 the total number of explanations is shown, in case any critic wishes to use it in checking up the conclusions expressed.

There are several other disturbing elements, any one of which might distort the surface appearance of the folk-lore we are considering. Suppose, for example, that a mythology consists of twenty long tales and twenty short ones, and that only the long tales have explanations, one to each: we should say that fifty per cent of the tales are without explanations. But if we counted up the number of pages of myth material involved in the tales which have an explanatory ending, we might find that the explanatory traditions occupied twice the number of pages. It must, as a matter of fact, be admitted that the tales considered in working out the results below vary greatly in length. Some of the "tales" consist of only a few sentences recounting an incident in the life of some mythical character. Others are very long, and, from the literary point of view, complex narratives, occupying many pages of print. It is a fact, however, that some of the longest tales contain no explanations at all. A short tale is as likely to explain something as one of the longer ones. As a matter of fact, the explanations are distributed through the total number of tales, irrespective of their length.

The various tales considered also differ greatly from one another in their character or setting. We find cosmogonic traditions, hero stories, stories about the origin of secret fraternities, stories of human heroes who have supernatural adventures or encounters, narratives of divine or human exploits, and so on through a long classification. Many mythologies are made up in part of humorous or facetious stories about some trickster or other, — Coyote in the West; Raven or Mink on the North Pacific coast; Old Man, Ictinike, Nih'a^{n}ça^{n} or Rabbit, on the Plains. The question that now arises is this: In reckoning the total number of tales, and finding the proportion of explanatory tales distributed through them, is it fair to ascribe equal weight to all of these classes? What right have we to compare cosmogonic tales with hero stories, or sacred formulas with trivial trickster stories? The answer is simple. Contrary to what one might expect, the "cosmogonic" traditions, in the first place, do not contain all of the explanations, by any means. A very "trivial" tale is as likely to contain an explanation as is a solemn religious recital. Moreover, tales which would appear to be most trivial in plot and in circumstance, sometimes explain the most serious matters. One and the same tale, as a matter of fact, may serve two quite different purposes among, for example, two neighboring peoples. The story

of "The Girl and the Dog," to give an instance, in which a dog assumes human form and succeeds in marrying a girl, is told on the plains of North America merely as an interesting tale.[1] Among the Eskimo it is told in connection with a story explaining the existence of sea-mammals, the most important single factor in the life of the people; and it supplies the background for the chief feature of their religion, the seal taboos.[2] On the North Pacific coast also it has a religious application, accounting for or explaining a certain religious taboo and the origin of a secret society.[3] Another example of this same general fact, which would occur to any one familiar with the American field, is the Two-Brothers myth of the Sauk, which is told in connection with the Mide or Medicine Society. This sacred tradition is merely a version of a very common and quite secular story.[4] Other examples to illustrate the principle might easily be cited, such as the Raven myth of the Tlingit, itself partaking of a sacred character,[5] but containing incident after incident which is found also in the ordinary non-sacred folk-lore of the region.[6] The religious myth, generally speaking, is not at all different in its structure or its subject-matter from the non-religious one. The setting which a tale may have is often apparently a mere matter of chance, or may be the result of a combination of several forces; but the setting of a tale does not seem to affect its explanatory value. In spite, therefore, of the fact that, on the surface, myths and folk-tales seem to present a quite diversified appearance and to fall in many cases into certain well-defined classes, the subject-matter and the treatment are throughout quite the same; and one class does not seem to have any more explanatory possibilities than another. It does not seem necessary, therefore, in investigating the explanatory function of mythical tales, to draw distinctions of which the native informant himself is unaware. In treating of the explanatory character of myths and folk-tales, we may disregard their setting, just as we may the matter of their relative length. The explanatory phenomenon seems to run through all folk-tales, irrespective of both setting and length.

The only other statement that needs to be made in a preliminary way is that the mythologies here studied were studied as they stand, in the form in which they now exist. Thus, in the following tabulation

[1] For example, among the Assiniboin (p. 224).

[2] Eskimo, 2, p. 583; 3, p. 163.

[3] Kwakiutl, 2, p. 401.

[4] Fox, p. 337; Ojibwa, p. 35.

[5] Tlingit, 1, p. 80, note 1.

[6] For example, the incident of the hero who was swallowed by a whale (*Ibid.*, p. 91), and that of the girl who insults the bears (p. 126). A still better example is offered by the inclusion, in the Raven myth, of the tale in which a trickster imitates his hosts (Haida, 1, p. 132); see also Boas (this Journal, vol. ix, p. 2) for a discussion of this point.

those tales are reckoned as explanatory in which the statement is made that something is explained; nearly always on the authority of the native informant, more rarely on that of the translator. In cases of doubt, however, the given passage was placed without exception on the explanatory side.

TABLE SHOWING PROPORTION OF EXPLANATORY TALES IN A NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVE NORTH AMERICAN MYTHOLOGIES.

Regions.	Tribes.	Number of tales.	Number of explanations.	Number of tales with explanations.	Percentage of tales with explanations.
Arctic	Cumberland Sound Eskimo	98	34	17	17
Woodland	Micmac	43	22	8	19
	Abnaki	29	27	14	48
	Ojibwa	38	28	19	50
	Fox	46	16	11	24
Plains	Assiniboin	98	32	20	20
	Blackfoot	97	86	52	54
	Dakota	14	14	7	50
	Grosventre	42	15	8	20
	Arapaho	100	81	32	32
	Omaha-Ponca	50	21	15	30
	Pawnee (Skidi)	113	99	47	42
Southwest	Hopi	85	49	17	20
	Jicarilla	39	40	20	51
California	Yana	21	35	12	57
Plateau	Shoshoni	45	54	12	27
	Thompson	73	111	52	71
	Shushwap	69	60	33	48
North Pacific	Chinook	21	24	10	42
	Bella Coola	53	57	23	43
	Kwakiutl	177	133	78	44
	Haida	102	108	44	43
	Tlingit	107	68	38	35
	Chukchee	35	11	3	9
	Koryak	131	5	5	4

It will be seen at once that this tabulation presents some curious features. In the first place, it is evident that in most mythologies rather less than half the tales seem to have any explanatory value. There is so much variation that it is hard to formulate any actual rule. For example, the Jicarilla, Yana, and Blackfoot mythologies have more explanatory than non-explanatory tales. In this, however, they differ from all other American mythologies, in which the number of explanatory tales is uniformly less than half of the total number of traditions.

It is perhaps worth noting that, of the mythologies named, the Yana is represented by a very small collection. The figures for this mythology are based really on incomplete returns. It is at least conceivable that, if the number of tales examined could be increased, the high percentage might tend to disappear. This is rendered still more plausible by the fact that, in nearly all cases where very large collec-

tions exist, the number of explanatory traditions is relatively small. The Kwakiutl, Eskimo, Assiniboin, Arapaho, Pawnee, Haida, and Tlingit mythologies might be cited. In fact, there is only one exception; namely, the Blackfoot. Why the Blackfoot percentage is so high is not so easily explained; though the present writer is of the opinion that the cause is an historical, not directly a psychological one,—a matter which can best be discussed in the light of certain facts to be brought out later.

Even leaving aside the exceptional cases, however, the percentages show a marked variability. Where Fox mythology shows the presence of twenty-four per cent of explanatory tales, Pawnee shows forty-two. Where Eskimo shows seventeen, Koryak shows only four. It would perhaps be dangerous to infer that all of these variations correspond to actual difference in the mental processes of the various groups of people concerned. They may be due, at least in part, to the personal peculiarities of the informants from whom the stories were obtained, or to the literary style or the interest of the recorder or the translator. There is, however, one general tendency exhibited in the tabulation, which I believe we may consider to represent a real fact in American folk-lore. I refer to the fact that the arctic mythologies are, on the whole, deficient in explanations. Since this point is brought out in connection with all the arctic peoples considered (Eskimo, Chukchee, and Koryak), and since the number of explanations shows a steady decrease as we pass from south to north, especially along the Pacific coast, where our material is most reliable, I regard it as at least probable that we are here dealing with a real characteristic of the mythologies in question.

It might be possible to ascribe the absence of explanations in a certain portion of our printed sources to the failure of investigators to record them. This would of course do away with the problem altogether. In view of certain features of the tabulation, however, I am inclined to regard this contingency as unlikely. It will be seen, for example, that in all the cases where the results are based on a small number of tales, the percentage of explanations runs very high. On the other hand, where the results in the tabulation are based on large and presumably exhaustive collections of tales, the percentages are, as a rule, very much lower. In other words, the explanatory type of tale seems to be the first type to be recorded. I suspect, moreover, that the ordinary investigator is interested in the explanations, if anything, more than the native informant is. I think it safe to conclude that the scarcity of explanations in the tabulation represents a real phenomenon, and not mere accident.

In view of the irregularities in the tabulation, of which we can give no really satisfactory account except in certain instances, perhaps the

best way to arrive at a conclusion would be to work out a general average for the results obtained. If we take the average of the various per cents, we arrive at a general average of approximately thirty-six per cent. We may say with a fair degree of accuracy, perhaps, that, if a hundred typical American tales are taken at random, about thirty-six of them will be found to involve explanations. From the material so far considered, I am tempted to draw the conclusion that, in the folk-literatures we are considering, explanatory tales are not proved to be conspicuous by their actual number. Certainly there is a large part of folk-lore which is not at the present time explanatory.

The additional point is to be made that in a very large number of cases, perhaps in the greater part of them, the explanations are brought in quite casually. From the places they occupy in a given tale, and the manner of their appearance, they seem to be chance features, put in for good measure, or for other reasons, perhaps, which are not concerned directly with the plot. To illustrate this point, I might call attention to the tabulation of the familiar Dog-Husband story on pp. 28–30. The total number of episodes which make up the story in its fullest form are arranged in series at the top of the tabulation. The incidents which are present in the version belonging to any particular tribe have been shown by writing the name of the tribe in the appropriate column. A blank space at any point in the line devoted to any tribe or version indicates that the incident which is represented by that space is lacking. The explanations involved are shown in bold-face type in the position which they really occupy in the table. The irregularity of the place of occurrence, relative to the other incidents of the tale, is quite as noticeable as are the inconsistencies in the explanations themselves. I believe that any one who looks over the table will get the impression, as the present writer does, that the explanations are merely casual in the tale, and are brought out wherever the story seems to fit certain problems which the story-teller has in mind. A similar tabulation might be worked out, I believe, for almost any mythical tale, though the present one is an excellent illustration. The distribution of explanations through the versions of any given tale seems to be the result of chance.

In connection with our second problem, several points accordingly become evident. The actual number of tales with an explanatory function is not overwhelming. In some mythologies it is extremely small. Whether or not these tales have dropped off explanations they may once have had, is a point that will be taken up presently. In the mean time the present state of folk-lore is one in which the explanation is certainly not the matter of prime interest in tales. The explanation in explanatory tales is manifestly a casual phenomenon now, whatever is true of the past.

DOG-HUSBAND STORY.

Sources.	Episodes.						
	1. Girl has commerce with dog.	2. Identifies him with paint.	3. Gives birth to puppies.	4. Is abandoned; fire put out.	5. Steals children's dog-blankets, making them human.	6. People obliged to return and ask her for food.	7. Dog children have adventures.
Cumberland Sound Eskimo 3, p. 165	Cumberland Sound Eskimo	.....	Cumberland Sound Eskimo. *Expl.*: **Puppies become Inlanders and Europeans**	.....	.....	.....	.....
Tlingit (1), p. 100	.....	.....	Tlingit (1)	.....	Tlingit (1)	.....	Tlingit (1) (+ Four Brothers myth). *Expl.*: **No monsters now; Milky Way; certain rocks, etc.**
Tlingit (2), p. 269	Tlingit (2)	.....	Tlingit (2)	Tlingit (2)	Tlingit (2)	.....	Tlingit (2) (+ Paint Identification). *Expl.*: **Rainbow; Thunder.**
Kwakiutl (2), p. 401	.....	.....	Kwakiutl (2)	.....	Kwakiutl (2)	.....	Kwakiutl (2) (+ Cannibal-at-North-End-of-the-World). *Expl.*: **Winter Dance of Heiltsuk group.**
Kwakiutl (Sagen), p. 132	Kwakiutl (Sagen)	Kwakiutl (Sagen) (pitch)	Kwakiutl (Sagen)	Kwakiutl (Sagen)	Kwakiutl (Sagen)	Kwakiutl (Sagen) *Expl.*: **People turn into certain rocks in the ocean**	.....
Bella Coola (Sagen), p. 263	Bella Coola (Sagen)	Bella Coola (Sagen)	Bella Coola (Sagen)	Bella Coola (Sagen)	Bella Coola (Sagen). *Expl.*: **Women do not bear puppies now**	Bella Coola (Sagen)	.....

DOG-HUSBAND STORY. — *Continued.*

Sources.	Episodes.						
	1. Girl has commerce with dog.	2. Identifies him with paint.	3. Gives birth to puppies.	4. Is abandoned; fire put out.	5. Steals children's dog-blankets, making them human.	6. People obliged to return and ask her for food.	7. Dog children have adventures.
Nootka (Sagen), p. 115	Nootka (Sagen)	.....	Nootka (Sagen)	Nootka (Sagen)	Nootka (Sagen)	Nootka (Sagen). *Expl.*: **People transformed into Islands in Barclay Sound.**	
Tlaamen (Sagen), p. 92	Tlaamen (Sagen) (chews bewitched gum)	.....	Tlaamen (Sagen)	Tlaamen (Sagen). *Expl.*: **Rocks N. E. of Cape Mudge**	Tlaamen (Sagen)	Tlaamen (Sagen)	Tlaamen (Sagen). *Expl.*: **Oldest pup becomes ancestor of Tlaamen group.**
Fraser River (Sagen), p. 25	Fraser River (Sagen)	.....	Fraser River (Sagen)	Fraser River (Sagen)	Fraser River (Sagen). *Expl.*: **Pups become ancestors of a tribe or clan.**	.....	.....
Thompson (1), p. 62	Thompson (1)	Thompson (1)	Thompson (1). *Expl.*: **Dog taboo for women**	Thompson (1) (without fire episode)	Thompson (1) (throws medicine on children)	Thompson (1)	.....
Carrier (1), p. 28	Carrier (1)	Carrier (1)	Carrier (1)	Carrier (1)	Carrier (1)	.....	Carrier (1) (+ Ascent to Sky). *Expl.*: **Orion; another star; Pleiades.**
Dog-Rib (P.), p. 311	Dog-Rib (P.)		Dog-Rib (P.)	Dog-Rib (P.)	Dog-Rib (P.)		*Expl.*: **The Dog-Rib Tribe.**
Chilcotin (1), p. 7	Chilcotin (1)	Chilcotin (1)	Chilcotin (1)	Chilcotin (1)	Chilcotin (1)	Chilcotin (1)	Chilcotin (1) (+ swallowed Hero). *Expl.*: **All animals.** (+ Crane Bridge). *Expl.*: **Birth; sea-gull.** *Expl.*: **Animal traits; human traits; tobacco, etc.**

DOG-HUSBAND STORY. — *Concluded.*

Sources.	Episodes.						
	1. Girl has commerce with dog.	2. Identifies him with paint.	3. Gives birth to puppies.	4. Is abandoned; fire put out.	5. Steals children's dog-blankets, making them human.	6. People obliged to return and ask her for food.	7. Dog children have adventures.
Ts'ets'aut (1), p. 37	Ts'ets'aut (1)	.....	Ts'ets'aut (1)	Ts'ets'aut (without fire episode)	Ts'ets'aut (1)	Ts'ets'aut (1)	Ts'ets'aut (1) (+ growing Rock). *Expl.*: **A certain red cliff.**
Blackfoot (1), p. 107	Blackfoot (1)	.....	Blackfoot (1) (children, not puppies)	.....	.....	.....	Blackfoot (1). *Expl.*: **Dog Society.**
Quinault (1), p. 127	Quinault (1)	.....	Quinault (1)	Quinault (1)	Quinault (1)	Quinault (1)	.....
Kathlamet (1), p. 155	Kathlamet (1)	.....	Kathlamet (1)	Kathlamet (1)	Kathlamet (1)	.....	.....
Koryak (1), p. 183	Koryak (1)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Chukchee (1), p. 158	Chukchee (1)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

DOG-HUSBAND (PLAINS VERSION).

Sources.	Girl has commerce with dog.	Identifies him with paint.	Gives birth to puppies.	Drives father-dog away.	Father leads puppies away also.	Mother follows; finds them to be people in the night-time.	
Cheyenne (1), p. 181	Cheyenne (1)	Cheyenne (1)	Cheyenne (1)	Cheyenne (1)	Cheyenne (1)	Cheyenne (1). *Expl.*: **Pleiades**	.....
Arapaho (1), p. 209	Arapaho (1)	Arapaho (1)	Arapaho (1)	Arapaho (1)	Arapaho (1)	.....	Arapaho (1). *Expl.*: **Why dogs remain friends of people.**

We have seen also that the number of explanations in present-day folk-lore has the appearance merely of being relatively large. In some cases it seems probable that a folk-lore assumes an explanatory complexion through the interpretation, not of the native informant, but of the civilized investigator. It must be remembered that our material has been favorably selected with regard to explanatory tales. There is no question but that the typical investigator would rather record tales which involve explanations than those without. This tendency is reflected in the fact, shown above, that every collection which includes a small number of tales shows an extremely high percentage of tales with explanatory endings. If an investigator is successful in making his collections[1] complete, the proportion of explanatory tales diminishes. In regard to the second problem, therefore, *How important are the explanations in folk-tales?* it may be inferred that the element of explanation is not of primary significance.

IN THAT PART OF MYTHOLOGY WHICH CONSISTS OF EXPLANATORY TALES, IS THE EXPLANATION THE BASIS OF THE STORY?

It is well to refer again at this point to the tabulations already considered, which show what primitive tales explain. We see by examining the table, that, so far as stories are told with intent to explain, some groups or tribes have one purpose in view, others quite a different one. For example, the Pawnee, the Blackfoot, the Arapaho, and the Kwakiutl feel themselves obliged to account, above everything, for certain ceremonial institutions. I regard this as a most important point. More explanations in these cases refer to ceremonies than to any other one thing in the lives of the people. Where the Fox or the Assiniboin, and most American tribes, have their interest centred in animal traits, the Pawnee or the Kwakiutl are interested most of all in their tribal ceremonies, even the traits of animals coming second.[2] Now, is it possible to say anything about the relative antiquity of these two "interests"? Which developed first in point of time,—the interest in the peculiarities of animals, or the interest in highly developed ceremonial performances? Fortunately we do not have to rely purely on internal evidence. We know from outside sources, that in certain regions of America there has been a comparatively recent development of ceremonialism. One ritualistic wave has in historical times submerged the Pawnee, the Arapaho, and the Blackfoot, and is even yet spreading. Its centre of distribution is not altogether easy to establish, but certainly lies somewhere in the Central Plains. Another and totally different ceremonial wave (quite different in

[1] See p. 12.

[2] See p. 25.

details, even though the underlying ideas are not altogether unlike) has within a comparatively recent period spread outward from the Kwakiutl of Vancouver Island. Like the former wave, it is still making itself felt, in spite of the breaking-down of aboriginal institutions and the enrolment of many natives as members in the various churches. In both regions, on the North Pacific coast as well as on the Plains, the tendency toward complicated rituals has expressed itself in the formation of secret societies. In both these cases the initial development of the ceremonial impulse took place just before our history begins. The impulse was already well under way when the white man arrived on the scene. Since the time, however, when the phenomenon first came under observation, the diffusion has proceeded with fair regularity, In many cases we know, from linguistic and other evidence, exactly how it proceeded. Since the ritualistic ideas have spread, if they did not originate, largely within the historic period and under observation, we may feel rather certain that the entire impulse in its present form is not of any great antiquity. Yet the peoples' mythology is now primarily concerned with this ceremonialism. The actual content of the Blackfoot tales is not altogether different from that of the Grosventre or the Fox. The same sort of plots and the same literary devices are employed in both. The same remark will apply to the Kwakiutl and their neighbors, who have in some degree the same tales. Only the interest in ceremonials is peculiar to the Blackfoot or the Kwakiutl. On the not unlikely theory that the most widely diffused phenomenon is the oldest, it is evident that the story-making impulse is older than this ceremonial interest. It would be absurd to suppose that a tale told by the Kwakiutl to explain some recent ceremony, and by other tribes far and wide for purposes merely of recreation, must have originated in connection with these ceremonies. The intent in telling stories, then, has, among the Kwakiutl of Vancouver Island and the Pawnee of Nebraska, actually undergone a revolution. It would be quite arbitrary to assume that the whole mythology in these cases has developed since the use of ceremonies. In some cases, in fact, a given story which is found over a whole region, and must be of relatively great age, is among these ritualizing tribes turned to a ceremonial use. In the case of the tribes cited, then, a new sort of explanation has been read into an already existing mythology. This case is an instructive example of how a whole mythology may be re-interpreted.

A few rather curious examples of re-interpretation, having a certain bearing on this problem, have come to light in the preceding study. For example, the horse was unknown to the American Indians until introduced by the whites in the sixteenth century. Naturally the animal could not have appeared in American folk-lore

before that date. Upon its introduction, it became a factor of utmost importance in the life of the people, and the natives must have felt (and in many cases did feel) the necessity of explaining it. If tales originate as explanations, it would seem that new tales would have been invented, either consciously or unconsciously, to explain the horse. So far as I know, nothing of the sort happened. One mythology, the Hopi, contains a passage which explains that the horse was created by a woman, who rubbed scales from her skin and transformed them into the horse, which had never before been seen. This is merely a section from a very old myth, which is here re-interpreted. The Hopi explain a number of things by saying that a mythical person created them by rubbing cuticle from his skin, and making it into the required shape.[1] This is apparently a very old element in their folk-lore, much older than the possession of the horse. The episode of the "cuticle-being" — a being made by rubbing scales from the skin — is of very wide distribution in America outside of the Hopi tribe. An old mythical incident has merely been revamped in this case to serve as an explanation of a new thing. Similarly, the Yuman peoples tell that mankind was created from the earth of a certain mountain (among the Diegueño called Wikami; among the Mohave, Avikwame).[2] This tale is almost certainly older than their contact with the whites. The modern version of the myth among the Diegueño adds that the mountain was half of dark-colored earth, and half of light. The Indian tribes were created from the dark half; the Mexicans, from the other.[3] Good examples abound of this tendency to read new meanings into old passages. For example, the Arapaho use the Rolling-Skull story to explain the railroad;[4] and a Tlingit informant imagines that the story of the supernatural canoe, which requires to be fed as it travels,[5] refers to the steamboat. Certainly these are interesting cases where the call for explanations resulted, not in new tales, but in re-interpretations of old ones. In these cases, demonstrably, explanations have been "read in."

Many of the explanations which occur in North American tales in their present form are therefore only associated with the tales. In answer to the question, How does this association arise? we might say that, after a tale has taken a given form, an analogy is discovered between the occurrences which the tale describes and the facts in nature which happen to strike the observer's notice. Under such circumstances, either these analogies are interpreted as proof that the tale is true, or else the tale is read back into the distant past, and is

[1] Hopi, pp. 6, 7, 8.
[2] Mohave, p. 315; Yuma, p. 326.
[3] Diegueño, p. 302, note.
[4] Arapaho, 1, p. 19, note 3.
[5] Tlingit, 1, p, 129, note a.

imagined to explain such natural occurrences as fit into the plot. We may assume that in many cases a given tale which is now used to explain a number of things, has merely supplied a basis for the recognition of analogies. In many cases, of course, the analogy between a phenomenon and the chance arrangement of elements in any certain story, has not so far been discovered or recognized. In these cases we may find a rationalizing belief existing, which stands alone, secure in its own vigor, and is not made a part of folk-tales. Of such sort are the beliefs in the thunder-bird, or the eclipse-producing monster referred to above. Such speculations may be formulated in definite terms, may become codified, and may become a social force without ever coming into association with novelistic tales. Such formulated speculations are of course myths, whatever else may be included under that title. When an analogy or parallelism is discovered between such an idea and the course of events in any particular folk-tale, I think the result would be one of the explanatory tales that we have been considering. Certainly new facts are often explained by noting analogies in old tales.

We see, therefore, that re-interpretation is a factor in the formation of explanatory tales which must be taken into account. The point which must now be considered is whether re-interpretation can be proved to operate very generally. I should like to call attention, in this connection, to certain specific tales in relation to which re-interpretation has manifestly taken place. There has been, as is now well known, a widespread diffusion of tales over the American Continent. The result is, that a very considerable part of the tales known to one tribe is known also, sometimes in slightly different form, to all neighboring tribes. Perhaps the most interesting point that comes out in the study of American folk-lore is the fact that a tale can travel for enormous distances.[1] In some cases tales have wandered thousands of miles from what we must consider their original home. For example, certain tales are common to the natives of eastern Greenland and western Alaska, and are known to tribes as far south as the Arkansas River.[2] A given tale usually radiates out from some central point, or centre of distribution, losing its character little by little in direct proportion to the distance from this centre. This diffusion of tales gives us some very interesting phenomena, and helps to shed light on the problem of the possible "dropping-off" of the explanatory significance of tales. In looking over a number of these

[1] Consult Boas, Indianische Sagen von der Nord-Pacifischen Küste Nord Amerikas (Berlin, 1895).

[2] An instance is the story of the girl and the dog (or "dog-husband"), mentioned above; or the story of the blind hunter deceived by his wife or step-mother. A general idea of the diffusion of these and certain other tales may be obtained by consulting the tabulations on pp. 41–50.

diffused tales, it becomes evident that very profound discrepancies exist in the explanations which are attached to a given tale by different peoples, or, for that matter, by different informants in a tribe. It is easily proved that, wherever a tale exists in a number of renditions or versions, the explanations tend to show great variability. While the various tales are changed somewhat at the hands of different people, the explanations change much more rapidly and much more radically. This point is perhaps worth illustrating in some detail. In the example below, one story is traced through its various renditions. With each version or repetition is listed the explanation which appears in connection with it. The tale here examined is a familiar one in North America, and occurs in almost identical form as far south as Patagonia.[1]

EXAMPLE ILLUSTRATING VARIATIONS IN EXPLANATIONS.[2]

Rolling Rock. — A trickster offends a bowlder by depriving it of a present already given it (by offering to run it a race, etc.). The rock pursues him up and down hill for a long distance, finally rolling on him and pinning him to the earth. The trickster appeals to certain birds, who break the rock and set him free. He then exhibits ingratitude.

Micmac (1, p. 317).....Flies.
Blackfoot (2, p. 165).....Bull-bat's mouth.
Cree (2, p. 296).....A creek's name.
Shoshoni (1, p. 264).....The Rocky Mountains.
Flathead (1, p. 245).....White tip on fox's tail.
Pawnee (1, p. 260).....Rocks are hard; dead coyotes are found.
Pawnee (1, p. 106).....Stones in creek-beds.
Arapaho (1, p. 68).....Bull-bat's mouth.
Arapaho (1, p. 159).....The Pleiades.
Assiniboin (1, p. 120).....No explanation.
Shoshoni (1, p. 263).....No explanation.
Ute (1, p. 260).....No explanation.
Cree (1, p. 210).....No explanation.
Arikara (1, p. 147).....No explanation.
Pawnee (1, p. 446).....No explanation.
Jicarilla (1, p. 234).....No explanation.

— Trickster is seized and held by rock; freed by birds.
Assiniboin (1, p. 114).....White spots on the wings of a certain bird.

— Boy hero shoots rock which pursues and kills people.
Jicarilla (1, p. 208).....Black spots on a certain rock.

[1] Spears, The Gold Diggings of Cape Horn, p. 159.

[2] The tribes are given on the left; the explanations, on the right. Additional tabulations illustrating this point will be found arranged alphabetically on p. 41.

Directing our attention for a moment to this tabulation, the following facts become evident. Of sixteen versions of the story, all substantially the same in outline, as illustrated by the abstract (disregarding for a moment the sixteenth version, which shows certain points of difference), five have no explanations at all. It is possible that these five, as suggested above, have lost an original explanatory significance which they may have had. Let us turn, then, to the remaining ten versions, and see whether it is possible to decide what that original significance may have been. The rather curious fact comes out, that there are eight totally distinct matters explained in the remaining versions of this tale. The question which then presents itself is, Can any one of these eight explanations be considered the original one, in connection with which the story took form? It would certainly be impossible, on the basis of the present evidence, to determine which, if any, is the original. Furthermore, it is absolutely self-evident that the same complicated tale cannot have been independently invented each time an explanation was called for, nor to explain eight different things. It is obvious, therefore, that at least seven of the versions represent a corruption or re-interpretation of the original tale. We can without fear of question say that seven of these eight explanations have been added in some way or other to a tale with which they have no genetic connection, to which they do not belong. This tabulation shows, then, that it is possible for a tale to pass from one tribe to another and to pick up explanations in the process.

The additional material on pp. 41–50 shows, moreover, that the story of the Rolling Rock is not peculiar in this regard. A great many other tales show exactly the same phenomenon. For example, the story of the Dancing Birds exists in twenty-one versions.[1] The explanations associated with it include such disconnected topics as (1) the awkward gait of the duck, (2) the red eyes of the turkey, (3) the fact that turtles do not bite, and, (4) the touchwood on birch-trees. A total of eleven explanatory passages refer to five unrelated topics. The story of the Eye-Juggler — an extremely picturesque tale, in which certain creatures have the power of taking out their eyes and playing games with them — exists in several forms. Considering the versions of one form merely,[1] we see that they explain a number of quite different things, — owl's eyes, mole's blindness, the marks on cottonwood-bark, and a place-name. One would suppose, in regard to some of these, that the plot of the story, connected as it is with eyes, acted as a suggestion, and that various animals with peculiar eyes (such as owl and mole) tended to become associated with the story. What the logical connection is, however, between the given

[1] See p. 44.

plot and such a non-optical matter as the marks on cottonwood-bark,[1] seems to be quite beyond discovery.

The tabulations on pp. 41–50, therefore, illustrate, I believe, as well as anything could, the lack of connection that sometimes becomes apparent between a given story and the various explanations that may appear in connection with it. In almost all cases where several versions of a story exist, some will explain one thing, some another, and some nothing at all. The mere absence of explanations in connection with certain versions of a story might be accounted for, perhaps, on the ground that they had dropped off; but the presence of so many unrelated explanations, or explanations of unrelated topics, with one and the same story, certainly demands a quite different explanation.

The particular stories represented in the tabulations under discussion have of course been selected for purposes of illustration. The tabulations were designed primarily to include some of the most widely known tales, which, because they are widely known, exist in the greatest number of forms or versions. The possibility that the explanations associated with a tale will be widely variant, increases of course with the number of versions which can be examined. It is perhaps only necessary to say, that, wherever a tale exists in several versions, the same phenomenon is to be expected. A tabulation, to show all the cases where this has happened in American folk-lore, would have to include, from the present indications, over half of all the material in existence. It is obviously impossible to represent such a body of facts in one set of tabulations. Moreover, the returns at the present time are not nearly full enough to render possible a tabulation that would be absolutely complete, even if such a tabulation were desirable. It may be said, however, that every single tale so far examined, falling within the requirements of our problem, shows this instability of explanations, either in the fact that, in some of its versions, explanations are altogether lacking, or, in most cases, that they differ from one another. Tabulations illustrating this point could be increased almost without limit. The writer feels quite sure that variance in explanations is a fundamental trait of American folk-lore.

There are some cases where the opposite would, at least on first consideration, seem to be true. That is to say, some tales exist, the plot of which would almost imply that a certain explanation was had in view when the plot was devised. I should like to give an example or two of this. The Fox Indians recount a story which deals with an encounter between opossum and skunk. Skunk, who is very sly, convinces opossum that his own tail is a snake. As he springs away in alarm, his tail of course follows him. He dashes away, running so

[1] See the fourth entry under "Eye-Toys," p. 44.

fast, in trying to escape, that the fur is all worn off his tail by friction with the ground. The conclusion of the story is, "That is why opossum has such a wretched tail with no fur on it." One would be almost inclined to admit that the Indian myth-maker here noted opossum's naked tail, conspicuously different from that of other animals, and set to work to explain it. The tale fits the facts so nicely, that there would seem to be almost necessarily a relation of cause and effect. Even here, however, the explanation is not necessarily a part of the tale. When we examine the Hopi version of the story,[1] we find that the victim is no longer opossum with his unfledged tail, but coyote, an animal with a beautiful brush. Coyote, in this latter version, is tricked by having an artificial tail affixed to him; and in running away from it he sets the prairie on fire. The plot is evidently the same at bottom. The telling of this story has nothing to do primarily with the poverty of fur on any animal's tail, though it is quite appropriate for such a purpose. The Koryak of Kamchatka tell a similar story,[2] also without explanatory features. In this tale, fox tricks wolf by tying a number of objects to his tail, and wolf kills himself by trying to run away from them.[3]

Even where, as in this case, the character of a story seems to imply that it was invented with the purpose of explaining some particular thing, the apparent indissolubility of the story and the explanation can often be shown to be really a matter of superficial association merely. Perhaps the most convincing example of all is the following. The Ojibwa tell a story[4] of a contest between an old man living amid the snow and a young visitor from the South. They engage in a contest of powers, the old man attempting to freeze his guest, the young man enduring without complaint. The old man finally gives up, and, as Schoolcraft recounts the story, melts and disappears. The whole is interpreted by Schoolcraft as an allegory of summer and winter. The tale would certainly be appropriate for explaining why winter is not eternal, especially as other American tribes feel that this is a point which must be explained.[5] The Arapaho have a very similar story about a young man who has a cold-enduring contest with a white owl.[6] The white owl in this story has control over the blizzard, or is perhaps a personification of it. The boy, when successful in withstanding the freezing power of the blizzard, gets certain privileges from the owl, just as heroes in many of the Plains myths get supernatural power from various animals. But the tale as told by the Arapaho has no connection with the seasons. Certainly the mere fact that an explanation is apropos in a tale does not mean that the two always appear in com-

[1] Hopi, p. 186.
[2] Or perhaps a version of the same story.
[3] Koryak, p. 189.
[4] Ojibwa, p. 96. Compare Abnaki, p. 134.
[5] Compare Shuswap, p. 671; Micmac, 1, p. 99.
[6] Arapaho, p. 304.

pany, nor does it mean that the explanation is the original partner in the combination.

As a matter of fact, the nature of the connection between a tale and its appendages is in many cases open to entire misconstruction. What might be taken for an ætiological narrative is often only a narrative with an incident added, to prove that the story is true. What might be and often is taken for explanation is in many cases only proof. This fact, which has been commented on by other writers,[1] is well illustrated by the theft-of-fire myth. In this tale, as told in western America, animals set out to steal fire, which is guarded by some half-malign being living at a distance. In carrying off the fire, as the story runs, the successful animals are scorched, leaving various marks on them. Thus, in the Shoshoni story,[2] ground-squirrel, who carries the fire, has a spot on his breast burned black. This spot is of course still to be seen on all squirrels. The Haida[3] say that deer was the successful thief, and that his tail is short because it was burned off at that time. The same tale is told elsewhere with different explanations associated with it, all of them connected with the fact that the animal was burned or scorched. Among these explanations are the scraggly neck of deer,[4] hawk's short beak,[5] deer's red legs,[6] and the black spots on the soles of rabbit's feet.[7] The purpose of the tale is not by any means to account for these markings, but rather, if anything, to account for the presence of fire among men. The incident about the animal in each case is put in so that the story will carry conviction. The implication is this: "If you don't believe it, look at the deer (hawk, rabbit, coyote), and you will see the very marks left on him by the stolen fire." In the well-known tale already quoted, bear and chipmunk quarrel about whether there is to be day and night, or continual night. Bear becomes incensed, and pursues chipmunk, who dashes into a hollow log. Bear's claws rake down his back, leaving the stripes which are to be seen to-day. Here the real motive of the tale is, if anything, to explain the succession of day and night. The incident about the stripes is put in to show that the occurrence really took place. It is only a fair guess that many of the so-called explanations are, in similar fashion, after-thoughts, put in by way of proof. If many of our tales are considered from this point of view, it is actually impossible to tell from the context what was the original implication of the passage, ætiological or evidential.

An example might make this clear. In the course of the winter ceremonial of the Kwakiutl Indians of Fort Rupert, in 1895,[8] certain dancers

[1] Lowie, "The Test Theme in North American Mythology" (this Journal, vol. xxi, p. 123).

[2] Shoshoni, p. 246. [3] Haida, 1, p. 135. [4] Tlingit, B, p. 314.
[5] Tlingit 1, p. 10. [6] Maidu, 1, p. 165. [7] Chilcotin, p. 15.

[8] For account of the ceremony and the attendant speeches see Kwakiutl, 2, p. 544.

came in dressed as killer-whales. In connection with their performance, it was related that the Transformer once visited their locality, and, as the result of certain difficulties between the human inhabitants and the killer-whales, transformed part of the whales into birds, the rest into sand. "For that reason," concluded the speaker, "the sand of this beach gives forth a sound when it is stepped upon."

A few moments later in the same ceremony, the next company of dancers came in dressed as birds. As the accompaniment of their dance, the speaker recounted the well-known story of "The Painting of the Birds." The crows, according to his oration, when the Transformer was painting the birds with their present gaudy colors, wished to be made especially brilliant, and so waited till the very last. By that time the paint was used up, and so the Transformer covered them with charcoal: hence their color to-day. Then the birds danced out of the cave where the painting took place. The speaker concluded his oration with the following words: "If you do not believe what I say, come and visit me, and I will show you the place." The point I wish to make is, that these two stories are precisely of the same sort. They were related by the same individual in connection with the same ceremony, under precisely similar circumstances. The real fact is, that they both "explained" the ceremony then under progress. I believe that it would be highly artificial to say that the native speaker's intention when he recounted the second of these tales was different from what it was when he recounted the first; yet the form of the first tale is such that we should have to classify it as ætiological, while the conclusion of the second is obviously evidential. In other words, on this occasion the form which the given tale took was largely determined by chance and by the speaker's feeling for literary effect. I am inclined to think this tendency has operated very generally in giving our North American tales their present form; exactly how generally, it is of course impossible to say, in that we have no insight into the native story-teller's mental attitude. It is safe to say that this tendency has made the number of "explanatory" tales seem larger than is really the case.

SUMMARY.

It seems to me, therefore, that we have a fairly definite answer to each of our problems. As regards the evolution of folk-tales, we may make the following points. Folk-tales in their present form do not show any traces of having taken shape from the contemplation of the heavenly bodies. We saw that the interest of primitive man really centres in the things immediately around him in his environment. This is rendered fairly certain both by a consideration of what is

explained and who are the actors and characters. Even where nature does enter into mythologies, the desire for *explaining* does not seem to be the moving factor. The explanations, on the contrary, seem to be purely secondary to the story-plots. Explanatory tales do exist, and some tales may be based on the desire to explain. Such tales, however, do not by any means constitute the bulk of traditional literature to-day. In attempting, moreover, to decide which part of mythology, the explanatory or the non-explanatory, is the older and "original" part, we must be governed by the consideration that many explanatory tales are not so by nature, but through accident and re-interpretation. We can observe the operation of re-interpretation in the case of certain mythologies as a whole. There are also a considerable number of cases where a definite tale is demonstrably older than the thing it is now supposed to "explain." The study of "disseminated" tales, where a plot is diffused over a large area with relatively little change, the explanations meanwhile working in or dropping off,[1] would seem to indicate that this priority of the tale with reference to the explanations is a very widespread phenomenon. In other words, as far as the present form of our mythical tales in North America is concerned, the story is the original thing, the explanation an after-thought. The ease with which this may be demonstrated in a great number of cases, coupled with the absence of evidence to the contrary, justifies the conclusion that in North America, generally speaking, tales do not originate as explanations.

TABULATIONS INDICATING THE VARIOUS EXPLANATIONS WHICH ARE ASSOCIATED WITH A NUMBER OF WELL-KNOWN TALES AND EPISODES.[2]

ARROW-LADDER. — Hero shoots an arrow upward, striking the sky, into which the arrow sticks. Then he shoots a second, which strikes the nock of the first; and a third, which strikes the second; gradually forming a chain. He clambers up this, finally reaching the sky-country.

Tillamook (1, p. 138)....Woodpecker's red head.
Achomawi (1, p. 166)....(Mountains; traits and cries of animals.)
Kwakiutl (3, p. 127).....No trees on mountains; tops of mountain crags are cracked.
Comox (S, p. 64).....Sun and moon.
Bella Coola (1, p. 96)....Goat and ermine are white; animals are lighter underneath.
Kwakiutl (4, p. 87).....Yellow cedar has dead tops.
Haida (1, p. 78)....."Taxet's Trail."
Fraser River (S, p. 31)...Snail is boneless, moves slowly.
Comox (S, p. 65).....Ducks are not blind.
Heiltsuk (S, p. 215).....Mussels are black.
Tsimshian (S, p. 278)....People are respectful to sun.
Quinault (1, p. 108).....Fish-hawk has good eyes; snail is blind.
Comox (S, p. 68).....No explanation.
Nootka (S, p. 117).....No explanation.
Kwakiutl (1, p. 157).....No explanation.
Newettee (S, p. 173).....No explanation.
Tsimshian (1, p. 88).....No explanation.
Kathlamet (1, p. 11).....No explanation.
Haida (1, p. 355).....No explanation.

[1] Consult Boas, "Growth of Indian Mythologies" (this Journal, vol. ix, p. 1).

[2] Explanations which are very loosely associated with the story-plot are placed in parentheses.

ARROW-LADDER (*Concluded*). — Hero climbs to heaven by means of a single arrow.	Koryak (1, p. 293).....	No explanation.
	Koryak (1, p. 304).....	No explanation.
	Yana (2, p. 214).....	Moon halo.
BEAVER AND PORCUPINE. — Beaver and Porcupine, two friends, begin to trick each other. Beaver abandons Porcupine in the middle of a lake. Porcupine, in revenge, induces Beaver to climb a tree far inland, and leaves him there.	Tlingit (1, p. 220).....	Broken appearance of tree-bark
	Tlingit (1, p. 44).....	Friends "fall out."
	Ts'ets'aut, (2, p. 43).....	Beaver lives in lakes; Porcupine does not come out in frosty weather.
	Haida (1, p. 44).....	No explanation.
	Tsimshian (1, p. 73).....	No explanation.
	Tsimshian (S, p. 305)....	No explanation.
	Hare (P, p. 234).....	No explanation.
	Shuswap (1, p. 655).....	No explanation.
— Beaver and Coyote.	Jicarilla (1, p. 231).....	No explanation.
BLIND DUPE. — A blind hunter and his relatives are starving. When game approaches, he draws his bow, and, asking his wife (mother-in-law, sister) to aim the arrow for him, makes a successful shot. Informed that the shot went wild, he goes hungry, while the relative eats the meat alone. The hunter's sight is restored by a water-fowl who dives into a lake with him. He then can revenge himself.	Eskimo (1, p. 99).....	Narwhal.
	Eskimo (3, p. 168).....	Narwhal.
	Eskimo (3, p. 169).....	Narwhal.
	Chilcotin (1, p. 35).....	Loon's white collar.
	Carrier (1, p. 171).....	Loon's white spots and collar.
	Kwakiutl (3, p. 447).....	A certain rock.
	Assiniboin (1, p. 204)....	No explanation.
	Arapaho (1, p. 285).....	Wives are sometimes deceitful.
	Tlingit (1, p. 104).....	No explanation.
	Haida (2, p. 212).....	No explanation.
	Loucheux (P, p. 84).....	No explanation.
	Hare (P, p. 226).....	No explanation.
BLOOD-CLOT BOY. — A hero develops from a clot of blood, and is secretly reared by an old couple. He revenges them on a warrior who abuses them, destroys monsters, and does wonderful feats.	Blackfoot (1, p. 53).....	The "Smoking Star."
	Maidu (1, p. 59).....	Cockle-burrs.
	Blackfoot (2, p. 29).....	No explanation.
	Dakota (1, p. 101).....	No explanation.
	Arapaho (1, p. 298).....	No explanation.
	Omaha (1, p. 48).....	No explanation.
	Grosventre (1, p. 82).....	No explanation.
	Pawnee (1, p. 80).....	No explanation.
— Blood-Clot Girl.	Arapaho (1, p. 320).....	Crow is black.
BUFFALO WIFE. — A man takes as his wife a female buffalo, who assumes the form of a woman and comes to live with his tribe. Later she becomes piqued, and with her child assumes the form of a buffalo again, and leaves her husband. The husband follows his wife and child to the buffalo village.	Blackfoot (1, p. 117).....	Bull-and-Horn and Matoki Societies.
	Blackfoot (2, p. 104).....	The Buffalo Dance.
	Arapaho (1, p. 395).....	Elk live in the mountains; the buffalo can be eaten.
	Pawnee (1, p. 284).....	Flutes.
	Arikara (1, p. 94).....	Ring-and-javelin game; the Buffalo Ceremony.
	Crow (1, p. 289).....	No explanation.
	Wichita (1, p. 199).....	No explanation.
	Arapaho (1, p. 389).....	No explanation.
BURNING CANNIBAL. — A cannibal or other monster is overcome in a struggle and burned up in a fire. The ashes, blown about by the wind, turn into creatures or different objects.	Tlingit (1, p. 276).....	(Cannibal.) Mosquitoes.
	Tlingit (1, p. 214).....	(Arrow-headed boy.) Gnats.
	Tlingit (1, p. 93).....	(Wolverene-man.) Gnats and mosquitoes.
	Haida (2, p. 265).....	(Brain-sucker.) Mosquitoes.
	Comox (S, p. 165).....	(Cannibal.) Mosquitoes.
	Comox (S, p. 64).....	(Monster devil-fish.) Devil-fish, certain rocks and eddies.

BURNING CANNIBAL.—*Concluded.*

Kwakiutl (4, p. 18).....(Cannibal bear.) Mosquitoes and horse-flies.
Dakota (2, p. 197).....(Fiendish woman.) Women cannot kill people by magic.
Pawnee (2, p. 239).....(Spider-woman.) Spiders; rheumatism.
Pawnee (2, p. 240).....(Spider-woman.) Tree-frogs.
Arapaho (1, p. 297).....(Magician father-in-law.) White clay.
Cheyenne.....(Magician father-in-law.) "Diamonds" and beads.
Zuñi (1, p. 364).....(Tarantula-man.) Small tarantulas are found everywhere.
Blackfoot (1, p. 153).....(Woman who sharpens her leg.) No explanation.
Shoshoni (1, p. 291).....(Cannibal.) No explanation.
Assiniboin (1, p. 183)...(Fiendish girls.) No explanation.
Grosventre (1, p. 90)....(Magician father-in-law.) No explanation.
Koryak (1, p. 296).....(Hero eats himself up.) No explanation.
Skokomish (S, p. 58).....(Cannibal.) No explanation.

CHILD AND CANNIBAL. — Children are carried off by a cannibal, but kill the cannibal and escape.

Kwakiutl (1, p. 431).....The Dzonoqwa Dance.
Kwakiutl (1, p. 87).....Ornaments worn by adolescent girls.
Heiltsuk (S, p. 224).....Frogs (?).
Bella Coola (S, p. 249)...No explanation.
Kwakiutl (1, p. 354).....No explanation.
Kwakiutl (3, p. 117).....No explanation.
Skokomish (S, p. 57),....No explanation.

— A crying child is taken underground by a supernatural being.

Haida (1, p. 328).....Ditches at Kaisun.

CLIFF-OGRE. — An ogre induces people to walk on a cliff, and kicks them over the edge with his foot when they do so. His children eat the bodies of the victims.

Chinook (1, p. 21).....(Traits of different tribes.)
Arapaho (1, p. 302).....Buzzard's bare head.
Navaho (1, p. 122).....(Traits of different tribes; birds of prey; Rocky Mountain sheep.)
Zuñi (1, p. 76).....Owls; falcons.
Micmac (1, p. 90).....No explanation.
Shoshoni (1, p. 260).....No explanation.
Shoshoni (1, p. 262).....No explanation.
Jicarilla (1, p. 203).....Birds (?).
Zuñi (1, p. 373).....Two stars; Milky Way; Rattlesnake has yellow poisonous fangs.
Wintun (1, p. 131).....Ground-squirrel.

CRANE-BRIDGE.[1] — A woman has commerce with an animal, and is killed by her husband. Her children run away, pursued by her skull, which rolls along the ground. When the children come to a river, they appeal to a bird to take them across. He does so, and, when asked the same favor by the skull, destroys it. Boys kill sister's lover.

Kathlamet (1, p. 118)....Robin does not eat people.
Chilcotin (1, p. 13).....(Sea-gull.)
Cree (2, p. 71).....Masses of foam on river.
Ojibwa (1, p. 267).....White fish.
Shuswap (1, p. 650).....Crane's peculiar appearance.
Dakota (1, p. 195).....No explanation.
Pawnee (1, p. 117).....No explanation.
Assiniboin (1, p. 178)....No explanation.
Micmac (1, p. 164).....No explanation.
Assiniboin (1, p. 143)....No explanation.
Quinault (1, p. 119).....No explanation.
Caddo (1, p. 650).....Duck's gaudy colors.

— Deer children escape from Bear.

Shoshoni (1, p. 254).....No explanation.

[1] See Rolling Skull.

DANCING BIRDS. — A trickster induces a number of birds to dance around him, keeping their eyes closed. The penalty for opening the eyes is that they will become red. As the birds dance, the trickster wrings their necks one by one. One of the dancers grows suspicious, opens his eyes, and gives the alarm. The rest escape.	Cree (1, p. 212)	Touchwood on birch-trees.
	Ojibwa (1, p. 30)	Diver's black feet, short legs.
	Menominee (1, p. 162)	Duck's red eyes.
	Menominee (1, p. 204)	Diver's red eyes, absence of tail.
	Fox (1, p. 283)	Diver's red eyes, tuft on head.
	Cheyenne (1, p. 165)	Duck's red eyes, crooked back and neck.
	Arapaho (1, p. 59)	Indians live on game; coyotes live by stealing.
	Dakota (1, p. 113)	Wood-duck's red eyes.
	Assiniboin (1, p. 114)	Turtles do not bite.
	Omaha-Ponca (1, p. 67)	Turkey has red eyes.
	Grosventre (1, p. 71)	No explanation.
	Crow (1, p. 288)	No explanation.
	Osage (1, p. 9)	No explanation.
	Pawnee (1, p. 265)	No explanation.
	Assiniboin (1, p. 111)	No explanation.
	Pawnee (2, p. 134)	No explanation.
	Dakota (2, p. 122)	No explanation.
	Jicarilla (1, p. 203)	No explanation.
	Abnaki (1, p. 186)	No explanation.
	Nenenot (1, p. 327)	No explanation.
DESERTED CHILDREN. — The children of a camp offend a chief by disturbing him (calling names, abusing his child). He orders the camp to be moved and the children to be left behind. They are later "helped" by a dog (wolf, superior being), and in turn disown the parents who abandoned them.	Blackfoot (1, p. 117)	Bull-and-Horn and Matoki Societies.
	Arapaho (1, p. 293)	Embroidery designs and technique.
	Blackfoot (1, p. 138)	No explanation.
	Assiniboin (1, p. 142)	No explanation.
	Blackfoot (2, p. 250)	No explanation.
	Grosventre (1, p. 104)	No explanation.
	Omaha-Ponca (1, p. 83)	No explanation.
	Micmac (1, p. 46)	No explanation.
DISINTEGRATION.[1] — Hero comes all to pieces, joint by joint and limb by limb, but remains alive.	Bella Coola (1, p. 99)	People limp to-day.
	Bella Coola (2, p. 275)	Deer exist.
	Yana (2, p. 203)	(Rolling-Skull story.) A bathing-place with magic powers.
	Kwakiutl (3, p. 167)	No explanation.
	Koryak (1, p. 309)	No explanation.
DRILLING FIRE IN MONSTER.[2] — Hero is swallowed by a monster; kindles a fire in the monster's interior with a fire-drill, and so causes his death.	Kwakiutl (1, p. 350)	Weather is good for four days at a stretch.
	Kwakiutl (4, p. 15)	Mosquitoes and horse-flies.
	Bella Coola (2, p. 256)	Stars.
	Haida (1, p. 362)	No explanation.
EYE-TOYS. — Trickster sees certain birds amusing themselves by throwing their eyes up into trees (racing their eyes around a mountain), and causing them to come back into their sockets. The trickster asks to be taught the trick, but, in spite of warning, does it once too often, and his eyes fail to return. He is obliged to replace them with a substitute.	Nez Percé (1, p. 19)	Catbird's red eyes, habits.
	Arapaho (1, p. 51)	Owl's yellow eyes.
	Arapaho (1, p. 51)	Mole's blindness.
	Arapaho (1, p. 51)	Marks on cottonwood-bark.
	Jicarilla (1, p. 229)	Marks on coyote's cheeks. Plums.
	Navaho (1, p. 90)	Coyote's yellow eyes.
	Hopi (1, p. 95)	A place-name.
	Zuñi (1, p. 268)	Coyote's yellow eyes.
	Blackfoot (2, p. 153)	No explanation.
	Blackfoot (2, p. 153)	No explanation.
	Assiniboin (1, p. 117)	No explanation.
	Jicarilla (1, p. 70)	No explanation.
	Sia (1, p. 153)	No explanation.

[1] Compare Rolling Skull, p. 47.

[2] See also Swallowed Hero, and Jonah.

EYE-TOYS (*Concluded*). — Snail lends his eyes to his blind wife, Crow.

Quinault (1, p. 92).....Snail is blind, crow black.

— Snail lends his eyes to Fish-Hawk (arrow-ladder). Hero takes out his eyes and puts them back.

Quinault (1, p. 108).....Snail is blind, fish-hawk keen-eyed.
Koryak (1, p. 182).....No explanation.
Koryak (1, p. 186).....No explanation.
Koryak (1, p. 321).....No explanation.

FOUND-IN-GRASS. — A woman is killed by a guest whom she entertains in spite of warning, and her unborn child is thrown out of doors. He survives, and grows up perfectly wild. Later he is captured by his father, tamed, and performs many wonderful deeds.

Blackfoot (1, p. 40).....Buffalo-tails, Medicine Lodge and songs.
Shoshoni (1, p. 282).....Snow on mountains; why people die of old age.
Crow (1, p. 303).....(Snakes have flattened heads.)
Arapaho (1, p. 342).....Twins.
Pawnee (1, p. 91).....No monsters.
Omaha-Ponca (1, p. 215)..No explanation.
Grosventre (1, p. 77).....No explanation.

GROWING ROCK.[1] — Hero takes refuge on a rock, which he by singing causes to grow, thus escaping.

Bella Coola (2, p. 256)...No explanation.
Yana (2, p. 37).....Certain split rocks; grizzly-bears.

GROWING TREE. — Heroine is induced to climb a tree in pursuit of a porcupine. The tree suddenly begins to grow, so that she cannot climb down again. She is carried up to the sky.

Grosventre (1, p. 190)....Moon-spots.
Arapaho (1, p. 337).....Snakes strike at men.
Arapaho (1, p. 338).....A certain star; people have the bow.
Arapaho (1, p. 329).....Moon-spots. (Buffalo are used for food.)
Shoshoni (1, p. 268).....No explanation.
Grosventre (1, p. 100)....No explanation.
Crow (1, p. 299).....No explanation.

— Growing tree carries hero to the sky.[2]

Blackfoot (1, p. 46).....A certain star.
Blackfoot (1, p. 53).....A certain star.

— Growing tree brings people from the underworld.

Jicarilla (1, p. 193).....People live on this earth.

— People are trapped on a growing rock.

Ts'ets'aut (2, p. 37).....A certain red cliff.
Shuswap (1, p. 623.....Indian-hemp bushes.
Arapaho (1, p. 79).....No explanation.
Jicarilla (1, p. 224).....No explanation.

IMITATING HOST. — Trickster is entertained by various animals, who produce food by magical means. He tries to imitate them when they return his visit, and fails miserably.

Ojibwa (1, p. 23).....Chipmunk's cough.
Omaha (1, p. 557).....Beaver's cleft toe.
Hopi (1, p. 209).....Coyote fat is good for ant-bites.
Kwakiutl (4, p. 147).....Raven's black and shrivelled feet.
Nootka (S, p. 106).....Raven's black feet and feathers.
Thompson (1, p. 41).....Coyote's shrivelled paws.
Tsimshian (1, p. 46).....Old men's hands are bent.
Quinault (1, p. 85).....Not much fat on bear's feet, nor meat on back; bluejay's tuft.
Micmac (1, p. 300).....No explanation.
Shoshoni (1, p. 265).....No explanation.
Pawnee (1, p. 239).....No explanation.
Navaho (1, p. 87).....No explanation.
Hopi (1, p. 202).....No explanation.
Chinook (1, p. 178).....No explanation.

[1] The episode is psychologically related to the Growing-Tree incident below.

[2] Compare the Star-Husband story, p. 49.

IMITATING HOST. — *Concluded.*	Comox (S, p. 76)	No explanation.
	Newettee (S, p. 177)	No explanation.
	Bella Coola (S, p. 245)	No explanation.
	Bella Coola (1, p. 93)	No explanation.
	Chilcotin (1, p. 18)	No explanation.
	Haida (2, p. 184)	No explanation.
	Kwakiutl (3, p. 237)	No explanation.
	Koryak (1, p. 315)	No explanation.
JONAH.[1] — A hero is swallowed by an enormous fish, but remains alive. By working on the monster's heart he kills it, it drifts ashore, and he escapes when the animal is eaten or cut up.	Ojibwa (1, p. 21)	Names of the squirrel and gull.
	Jicarilla (1, p. 201)	Gill-slits on fishes.
	Chukchee (1, p. 164)	No explanation.
	Tlingit (1, p. 91)	No explanation.
	Haida (1, p. 131)	No explanation.
MAGIC FLIGHT (*Obstacle Type*). — A rolling skull pursues and destroys people. In escaping from it the heroes of the tale throw certain objects behind them, which turn into obstacles. These delay the skull, and they succeed in making their escape.	Pawnee (2, p. 121)	Seventh star in the Pleiades.
	Arapaho (1, p. 13)	(Sky, earth, lodges.) Railroad.
	Arapaho (1, p. 278)	(Lakes and rivers.)
	Grosventre (1, p. 63)	No explanation.
	Pawnee (2, p. 447)	No explanation.
— A man kills his wife and cuts off her head, on account of her adultery with a snake. Her head pursues her children, who escape by throwing obstacles behind them, which delay the skull.	Cree (2, p. 71)	The Rocky Mountains.
	Cree (1, p. 202)	The sturgeon.
	Assiniboin (1, p. 177)	(Ursa Major.)
	Carrier (1, p. 4)	(The earth.)
	Dakota (2, p. 195)	No explanation.
	Cheyenne (1, p. 185)	No explanation.
— Unfaithful husband kills his wife, and cuts off her head. This head pursues her children, who are magically lifted over stationary objects, the skull following with difficulty.	Pawnee (1, p. 115)	No explanation.
— People escape from a monster or ogre through a magic flight, causing forests, thickets, canyons, mountains, rivers or lakes, or other natural objects, to spring up behind them.	Eskimo (3, p. 197)	Fog.
	Quinault (1, p. 116)	Certain rocks, a large and a small one.
	Nootka (B, p. 99)	Certain mountains and lakes.
	Blackfoot (1, p. 70)	Ursa Major.
	Grosventre (1, p. 107)	Ursa Major.
	Chukchee (1, p. 40)	No explanation.
	Koryak (1, p. 257)	No explanation.
	Koryak (1, p. 187)	No explanation.
	Kwakiutl (B, p. 164)	No explanation.
	Heiltsuk (B, p. 224)	No explanation.
	Heiltsuk (B, p. 240)	No explanation.
	Bella Coola (B, p. 268)	No explanation.
	Ts'ets'aut (1, p. 260)	No explanation.
	Chinook (1, p. 78)	No explanation.
	Omaha (1, p. 293)	No explanation.
MAGIC FLIGHT (*Bait Type*). — A skull pursues people, who delay it by causing attractive objects to appear behind them.	Pawnee (2, p. 35)	Sun, moon, the spots on them. (The Pleiades.)

[1] For a related motive see Swallowed by a Monster.

MAGIC FLIGHT (*Bait Type, Concluded*). — A monster or ogre is delayed through the same device.

Kathlamet (1, p. 118)....Traits of certain plants.
Maidu (1, p. 77).....The sun does not harm people.

MEAT TRICK. — The hero, in order to capture a bird (or to capture his wild brother), changes himself into a carcass or into a piece of meat. His quarry finally comes down, along with the other birds, to feed. The hero then instantly assumes his proper form and makes the capture.

Assiniboin (1, p. 107)....Color of eagle's head.
Blackfoot (2, p. 147).....Raven is black, lives by hunting about.
Menominee (1, p. 203)...Buzzard has a bald head and bad smell.
Omaha (1, p. 78).....Buzzard's head is bare and red.
Arapaho (1, p. 276).....Crow is black. (People have the buffalo.)
Assiniboin (1, p. 146)....No explanation.
Arapaho (1, p. 302?).....Buzzard's bare head (Cliff-Ogre story).

ROLLING ROCK. — (See tabulation on p. 35.)

ROLLING SKULL[1] (*Disintegration Type*). — A man comes all to pieces, leaving nothing of himself but the head (eats himself up, hands, feet, limbs, and body, the head remaining alive). He becomes an inhuman prodigy.

Yana (1, p. 203).....A certain bathing-place which has magical properties.
Maidu (4, p. 189).....People go crazy sometimes.
Koryak (1, p. 296).....No explanation.
Maidu (1, p. 97).....No explanation.

ROLLING SKULL (*Rolling Object Type*). — A skull or other object (compare the rolling-rock story on p. 35) pursues people by tumbling over and over (by flying through the air), and destroys them.

Chukchee (1, p. 18).....Children do not always die in infancy(?).
Arapaho (1, p. 8).....(Lakes and streams.) Railroad.
Eskimo (3, p. 255).....No explanation.
Blackfoot (1, p. 154).....No explanation.
Yana (2, p. 464).....No explanation.

SCRATCH BERRIES. — Trickster eats certain berries, in spite of warning. The berries cause him to experience an unheard-of itching.

Assiniboin (1, p. 127)....Coon's hairless rump.
Abnaki (1, p. 85).....Gum on trees.
Grosventre (1, p. 69).....No explanation.
Crow (1, p. 287).....No explanation.

SKIN-SHIFTER. — Hero or heroine kills a person, removes the skin from the corpse, puts it on, and in this disguise assumes the part of the dead person, deceiving the people.

Yana (2, p. 158).....(Topography, animal habits.)
Koryak (1, p. 322).....No explanation.
Haida (1, p. 110).....No explanation.
Haida (1, p. 137).....No explanation.
Haida (1, p. 147).....No explanation.
Shuswap (1, p. 676).....No explanation.
Yana (2, p. 216).....No explanation.
Shoshoni (1, p. 260).....No explanation.
Zuñi (1, p. 461).....No explanation.

SKIN-SHIFTER (*Old-Woman-and-Daughter Type*). — An old woman wishes to marry her own daughter's husband. She kills her daughter, puts on her skin, but is discovered and punished.

Pawnee (2, p. 45).....Clam-shell.
Pawnee (2, p. 506).....No explanation.
Eskimo (3, p. 185).....No explanation.
Assiniboin (1, p. 157)....No explanation.

[1] Thirteen versions of this tale have already appeared on p. 46, under the caption of the Magic Flight, since they involve that incident in addition to the Rolling-Skull episode proper. The following are versions of the story which do not involve the Magic Flight. A related motive to the present one will be found in the story of the Rolling Rock, p. 35. With the disintegration type compare the disintegration story on p. 44.

SKIN-SHIFTER (*Sham-Doctor Type*). — Hero, by a trick, wounds water-monsters who have killed and skinned his younger brother. He meets an old woman (or old man) going to doctor the sick monsters. He kills this doctor, puts on the skin, and pretends himself to be the doctor, imitating the proper gait and song. When he approaches the sick people to treat them, he suddenly kills them instead.	Ojibwa (1, p. 37)	Kingfisher's white medal and tuft.
	Blackfoot (1, p. 152)	Bears and rabbits are fat.
	Omaha (1, p. 241)	(Wolf and deer traits.)
	Cree (2, p. 74)	No explanation.
	Assiniboin (1, p. 147)	No explanation.
	Menominee (1, p. 133)	No explanation.
	Pawnee (1, p. 250)	No explanation.
	Shoshoni (1, p. 242)	No explanation.
— Hero tricks the supernatural beings by wearing an enemy's skin.	Chukchee (1, p. 45)	No explanation.
SKY BASKET. — Woman goes crazy, and desires to marry her younger brother. To escape from her, all the people have themselves drawn up to the sky in a basket. One of them looks down, however, and they are all spilled, falling back into their blazing home. Some survive.	Yana (1, p. 407)	A certain salt spring.
	Yana (2, p. 309)	Black bears are found everywhere.
	Shasta (1, p. 165)	Mountains; animal markings, cries, and traits.
	Achomawi (1, p. 166)	Mountains; animal traits and cries.
	Maidu (1, p. 71)	People sometimes go crazy.
SNARING SUN. — Hero snares the sun by setting a noose where the sun rises in the morning. To prevent a terrible catastrophe, the sun is with great difficulty set free.	Ojibwa (1, p. 239)	Dormouse is of small size.
	Omaha (1, p. 14)	Rabbit has yellow shoulders.
	Chipewyan (1, p. 184)	Mouse is yellow.
	Montagnais (1, p. 35)	No explanation.
	Menominee (1, p. 181)	No explanation.
	Fox (1, p. 79)	No explanation.
	Assiniboin (1, p. 140)	No explanation.
SON-IN-LAW TESTED. — Hero marries the daughter of a supernatural being, or a man with supernatural power. His father-in-law receives him kindly, but asks him to do certain things which involve great danger. The hero is successful in all the tests, and finally gets the best of the evil father-in-law.	Cheyenne (1, p. 177)	Beads and diamonds are kept by the whites.
	Cree (1, p. 205)	The Whiskey Jack.
	Maidu (1, p. 67)	Thunder does not kill people.
	Wintun (1, p. 121)	Ground-squirrel; eel; sun and moon; sky colors.
	Yana (1, p. 281)	Moon and stars.
	Chinook (1, p. 33)	(Sturgeon; bluejay.)
	Kwakiutl (4, p. 14)	Numerous devil-fish at Denman's Island.
	Micmac (1, p. 12)	No explanation.
	Assiniboin (1, p. 154)	No explanation.
	Assiniboin (1, p. 157)	No explanation.
	Grosventre (1, p. 88)	No explanation.
	Omaha (1, p. 160)	No explanation.
	Carrier (1, p. 7)	No explanation.
	Chilcotin (1, p. 26)	No explanation.
	Kathlamet (1, p. 113)	No explanation.
	Tsimshian (1, p. 130)	No explanation.
	Nootka (B, p. 118)	No explanation.
	Nimkish (B, p. 136)	No explanation.
	Newettee (B, p. 171)	No explanation.
	Newettee (B, p. 198)	No explanation.
	Koryak (1, p. 114)	No explanation.

STAR HUSBAND. — Two girls sleeping out at night notice two stars, and wish that they could marry them. In the morning they find themselves in the sky-country, with stars for husbands. Becoming homesick, they escape from heaven on a rope.

Pawnee (3, p. 197).
Blackfoot (1, p. 58)..... People have the turnip; the digging-stick; the Pole Star; songs of the Sun Dance.
Dakota (1, p. 90)..... (Meadowlark's song.)
Quinault (1, p. 108)..... (Fish-hawk is keen-eyed, snail is blind.)
Micmac (1, p. 160)..... No explanation.
Grosventre (1, p. 100).... No explanation.
Pawnee (1, p. 60)..... No explanation.
Wichita (1, p. 298)..... No explanation.
Otoe (1, p. 199)..... No explanation.

— Woman, lured by a porcupine, is carried to the sky on a growing tree, as the result of expressing a wish for a star husband.

Crow (1, p. 301).

SWALLOWED BY A MONSTER.[1] — People are swallowed by a hill (swamp, sucking-fish), and destroyed. The hero also has himself swallowed, cuts the monster's heart, thus killing it, and revives the people who have died.

Blackfoot (1. p. 57)..... "Ghost" dance.
Hopi (1, p. 83)..... Small ruins scattered over the country.
Blackfoot (2, p. 36)..... No explanation.
Grosventre (1, p. 85)..... No explanation.
Omaha (1, p. 34)..... No explanation.
Jicarilla (1, p. 200)..... No explanation.

SWING TRICK. — Old woman who wishes to marry her daughter's husband induces the young woman to swing over a pool of water. She then causes the swing to break, and the girl falls into the water. Here she is married by a water-monster, but, brought to the surface to nurse her human baby, she is rescued.

Jicarilla (1, p. 210)..... Frog (?).
Fox (1, p. 103)..... Lynx has a short tail; lynx are not eaten.
Arapaho (1, p. 12)..... (Lakes, rivers, swings.)
Cree (1, p. 205)..... No explanation.
Assiniboin (1, p. 157)... No explanation.
Osage (1, p. 26)..... No explanation.

— Magician has a water-monster which he feeds through the swing trick

Grosventre (1, p. 87)..... No explanation.

— Ogres drown people by getting them to swing.

Blackfoot (1, p. 57)..... (A certain star.)

TOOTHED VAGINA. — Woman's vagina is armed with teeth. Hence she causes the death of her husbands and lovers. The hero, by being warned beforehand, breaks the teeth with a hard object, thus succeeding where others failed.

Kwakiutl (B, p. 66)..... Sexual intercourse harmless now.
Kwakiutl (1, p. 95)..... (Dolphins; deer.)
Kwakiutl (B, p. 24)..... Footprints in a rock on the Lower Fraser; crag in Harrison River.
Chilcotin (1, p. 13)..... Sexual intercourse with Chilcotin women now innocuous.
Shoshoni (1, p. 238)..... Different hostile tribes.
Dakota (2, p. 198)..... Sexual intercourse now harmless.
Arapaho (1, p. 260)..... Vaginas now harmless.
Pawnee (1, p. 35)..... No toothed vaginas now.
Kwakiutl (4, p. 238)..... No explanation.
Bella Coola (1, p. 76).... No explanation.
Maidu (1, p. 69)..... No explanation.
Pawnee (2, p. 41)..... No explanation.
Wichita (1, p. 144)..... No explanation.
Jicarilla (1, p. 203)..... No explanation.
Chukchee (1, p. 72.)..... No explanation.

[1] Compare also Jonah, above.

TOOTHED VAGINA (*Concluded*). — Kala's anus has teeth.	Koryak (1, p. 116).....	No explanation.
TREE-REFUGE. — Heroes in running away from pursuing buffalo (deer, etc.) take refuge in a tree. They are discovered (by accident) and the animals hook the tree until it is ready to fall.	Blackfoot (1, p. 109).....	Front-Tails Society.
	Arapaho (1, p. 38).....	Buffalo Woman's Lodge.
	Arapaho (1, p. 158).....	Buffalo have short horns.
	Arapaho (1, p. 160).....	(Pleiades.)
	Arapaho (1, p. 394).....	Red spots in a certain kind of wood.
	Pawnee (1, p. 111).....	(Blackbirds perch on buffalo.)
	Caddo (1, p. 50).....	Buffalo do not eat people.
	Shoshoni (1, p. 293).....	No explanation.
	Grosventre (1, p. 102)....	No explanation.
	Zuñi (1, p. 165).....	No explanation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The following bibliography includes only the collections of myths referred to in the foregoing pages. References to general works are made in the footnotes. The titles below are grouped under the names of the tribes concerned instead of directly under the name of the author. Two miscellaneous collections of myths used in this study, and which, because they are miscellaneous, cannot be included under the name of any one tribe, are Franz Boas' "Indianische Sagen von der Nord-pacifischenKüste Nord Amerikas" (Berlin, 1895), and the "Traditions Indiennes du Canada Nord-Ouest" of Emile Petitot (Alençon, 1887). They are abbreviated as B. or Sagen, and P., respectively.

Abnaki:

C. G. LELAND, Algonquin Legends of New England. Boston, 1885.

Achomawi:

R. B. DIXON, Achomawi and Atsugewi Tales (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. xxi).

Arapaho:

DORSEY and KROEBER, Traditions of the Arapaho (Field Columbian Museum, Anthropological Series, vol. v).

Arikara:

G. A. DORSEY, Traditions of the Arikara (Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication 17).

Assiniboin:

R. H. LOWIE, The Assiniboine (Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, vol. iv, part 1).

Bella Coola:

FRANZ BOAS, The Mythology of the Bella Coola Indians (Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. i).

Blackfoot:

1. WISSLER and DUVALL, Mythology of the Blackfoot Indians (Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, vol. ii, part 1).

2. G. B. GRINNELL, Blackfoot Lodge Tales. New York, 1892.

Caddo:

G. A. DORSEY, Traditions of the Caddo (Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication 41).

Carrier:

FATHER MORICE, Three Carrier Myths (Transactions of the Canadian Institute, vol. v).

Cherokee:

JAMES MOONEY, Myths of the Cherokee (Nineteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, part 1).

Cheyenne:

A. L. KROEBER, Cheyenne Tales (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. xiii).

Chilcotin:

LIVINGSTON FARRAND, Traditions of the Chilcotin Indians (Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. ii).

Chinook:

FRANZ BOAS, Chinook Texts (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 20).

Chukchee:

W. BOGORAS, The Chukchee (Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. viii).

Cree:

1. FRANK RUSSELL, Explorations in the Far North. University of Iowa, 1898.
2. JOHN MACLEAN, Canadian Savage Folk. Toronto, 1896.

Crow:

S. C. SIMMS, Traditions of the Crows (Field Columbian Museum, Anthropological Series, vol. ii, no. 6).

Dakota:

1. S. R. RIGGS, Dakota Grammar, Texts and Ethnography (U. S. Department of the Interior, Contributions to North American Ethnology, vol. ix).
2. CLARK WISSLER, Some Dakota Myths (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. xx).

Diegueño:

T. T. WATERMAN, Religous Practices of the Diegueño Indians (University of California Publications in American Archæology and Ethnology, vol. viii).

Eskimo:

1. H. RINK, Tales and Traditions of the Eskimo. Edinburgh and London, 1875.
2. FRANZ BOAS, The Central Eskimo (Sixth Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology).
3. —— The Eskimo of Baffin Land and Hudson Bay (Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History, vol. xv).
4. A. L. KROEBER, Tales of the Smith Sound Eskimo (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. xii).
5. LUCIEN TURNER, The Ethnology of the Ungava District, Hudson Bay (Ninth Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology).
6. E. W. NELSON, The Eskimo about Behring Strait (Eighteenth Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology).

Flathead:

LOUISA MCDERMOTT, Myths of the Flathead Indians of Idaho (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. xiv).

Fox:

WILLIAM JONES, Fox Texts (Publications of the American Ethnological Society, vol. i).

Grosventre:

A. L. KROEBER, Gros Ventre Myths and Tales (Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, vol. i).

Haida:

1. J. R. SWANTON, Haida Texts and Myths (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 29).
2. —— Contribution to the Ethnology of the Haida (Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. v).
3. —— Haida Texts, Masset Series (Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. x).

Hopi:

H. R. VOTH, Traditions of the Hopi (Field Columbian Museum, Anthropological Series, vol. viii).

Iroquois:

ERMINIE A. SMITH, Myths of the Iroquois (Second Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology).

Jicarilla:

1. JAMES MOONEY, The Jicarilla Genesis (American Anthropologist, vol. xi).
2. P. E. GODDARD, Jicarilla Apache Texts (Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, vol. viii).

Kathlamet:

FRANZ BOAS, Kathlamet Texts (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 26).

Koryak:

W. JOCHELSON, Religion and Myths of the Koryak (Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. vi).

Kwakiutl:

1. BOAS and HUNT, Kwakiutl Texts (Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. iii).
2. FRANZ BOAS, The Social Organization and Secret Societies of the Kwakiutl Indians (U. S. National Museum, Report for 1895).
3. BOAS and HUNT, Kwakiutl Tales (Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology, vol. ii).
4. —— —— Kwakiutl Texts: Second Series (Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. x).

Maidu:

1. R. B. DIXON, Maidu Myths (Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History, vol. xvii).
2. —— Some Coyote Stories from the Maidu Indians (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. xiii).
3. STEPHEN POWERS, Tribes of California (U. S. Geological Survey, Contributions to North American Ethnology, vol. iii).
4. R. B. DIXON, Maidu Texts (Publications of the American Ethnological Society, vol. iv).

Menominee:

W. J. HOFFMANN, The Menominee Indians (Fourteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology).

UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA

Micmac:

S. T. RAND, Legends of the Micmac. New York and London, 1894.

Mohave:

A. L. KROEBER, Two Myths of the Mission Indians of California (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. xix).

Montagnais:

LEJEUNE, Jesuit Relations, vol. 12.

Navaho:

WASHINGTON MATTHEWS, Navaho Legends (Memoirs of the American Folk-Lore Society, vol. v).

Nenenot (Naskopi):

LUCIEN TURNER, Ethnology of the Ungava District, Hudson Bay (Ninth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology).

Nez Percé:

H. J. SPINDEN, Myths of the Nez Perce Indians (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. xxi).

Ojibwa:

H. R. SCHOOLCRAFT, The Myth of Hiawatha. Philadelphia, 1856.

Omaha and Ponca:

J. O. DORSEY, The Cegiha Language (U. S. Geological Survey, Contributions to North American Ethnology, vol. vi).

Osage:

G. A. DORSEY, Traditions of the Osage (Field Museum of Natural History, Anthropological Series, vol. vii).

Pawnee (Skidi):

1. G. A. DORSEY, Traditions of the Skidi Pawnee (Memoirs of the American Folk-Lore Society, vol. viii).
2. —— The Pawnee: Mythology (Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication 59).
3. G. B. GRINNELL, A Pawnee Star Myth (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. ii).

Quinault:

LIVINGSTON FARRAND, Traditions of the Quinault Indians (Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. ii).

Shasta:

R. B. DIXON, Shasta Myths (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. xxi).

Shoshoni:

R. H. LOWIE, The Northern Shoshone (Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, vol. ii).

Shushwap:

JAMES TEIT, The Shushwap (Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. ii).

Sia:

MATILDA C. STEVENSON, The Sia (Eleventh Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology).

Skokomish:

C. HILL-TOUT, Notes on the Skokomic of British Columbia (British Association for the Advancement of Science, Reports, 1900).

Thompson:

1. James Teit, Thompson River Indian Traditions (Memoirs of the American Folk-Lore Society, vol. vi).
2. —— Mythology of the Thompson Indians (Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. viii).

Tillamook:

Franz Boas, Traditions of the Tillamook Indians (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. xi).

Tlingit:

1. J. R. Swanton, Tlingit Myths and Texts (Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 39).
2. A. Krause, Die Tlinkit-Indianer. Jena, 1885.

Ts'ets'aut:

1. Franz Boas, Traditions of the Ts'ets'aut (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. ix).
2. —— Traditions of the Ts'ets'aut (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. x).

Tsimshian:

Franz Boas, Tsimshian Texts (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 27).

Ute:

1. A. L. Kroeber, Ute Tales (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. xiv).
2. J. Alden Mason, Myths of the Uintah Utes (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. xxiii).

Wichita:

G. A. Dorsey, Mythology of the Wichita (Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication 21).

Wintun:

Jeremiah Curtin, Creation Myths of Primitive America (Boston, 1898), pp. 1–278.

Yana:

1. Jeremiah Curtin, Creation Myths of Primitive America (Boston, 1898), pp. 280–284.
2. E. Sapir, Yana Texts (University of California Publications in American Archæology and Ethnology, vol. ix).

Yuma:

J. P. Harrington, A Yuma Account of Origins (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. xxi).

Zuñi:

1. F. H. Cushing, Zuñi Folk-Tales. New York, 1901.
2. —— Outlines of Zuñi Creation Myths (Thirteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology).

University of California,
Berkeley, Cal.

VITA

Birthplace

Hamilton, Missouri, April 23, 1885.

Education

High Schools of the State of California, 1899-1903; University of California, 1903-1907; graduate student, University of California, 1907-1909; Fellow in Anthropology, Columbia University, 1909-1910.

Anthropological Work

Museum Assistant, University of California, Museum of Anthropology, 1907-1908; Instructor in Anthropology, University of California, 1910-1913; Assistant Professor of Anthropology, University of California, 1913.

Publications

The Religious Practices of the Diegueno Indians. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, volume 8.

Analysis of the Mission Indian Creation Story. American Anthropologist, new series, 1909.

Phonetic Elements of the Northern Paiute Language. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, volume 10.

The Hudson Bay Eskimo. In Notes on New Collections, American Museum of Natural History, Anthropological Papers, volume 4.

RETURN TO the circulation desk of any
University of California Library
or to the
NORTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
Bldg. 400, Richmond Field Station
University of California
Richmond, CA 94804-4698

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS
2-month loans may be renewed by calling
(510) 642-6753
1-year loans may be recharged by bringing books
to NRLF
Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days
prior to due date

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

AUG 16 1993

SID: 04174

Record: 6 of

LDs: IN PROCESS 9
RenewalReq:
NewDueDate:

e North-America

0 1993

y of California

RT COMPLIANCE:

INSURANCE:

SYNCOA-1UPRISM ULBL

ILL record updated.

ILL Pending 930514
CAN YOU SUPPLY ? YE
:ILL: 4313610 :
:OCLC: 2232239
:Lender: *ZAP,ZAP,
:CALLNO:
:AUTHOR: Waterman,
:TITLE: The expla
Indians.
:IMPRINT: [Boston,
:VERIFIED: OCLC
:PATRON: ELSTER,A
:SHIP TO: ILL/Cent
Diego/ 9500 Gilman D
:BILL TO: same
:SHIP VIA: Library
:BORROWING NOTES: Z
:LENDING CHARGES:
:LENDING RESTRICTIO
:LENDING NOTES:

YC 49288

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES

C031237942